

The University of Chicago

THE OLD HITTITE KINGDOM A POLITICAL HISTORY

BASED ON A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

1937

By

ROBERT S. HARDY

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
Vol. LVIII, April, 1941

The University of Chicago

THE OLD HITTITE KINGDOM A POLITICAL HISTORY

BASED ON A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

1937

By
ROBERT S. HARDY

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
Vol. LVIII, April, 1941



THE OLD HITTITE KINGDOM A POLITICAL HISTORY

ROBERT S. HARDY

The work of writing a political history of the Old Hittite Kingdom is complicated by the nature of the available sources, and the resultant story is dependent upon the way those sources are employed or evaluated.¹ Fortunately, the task is somewhat simplified, because most of the documents have been collected and published in transliteration in one volume.² This, however, does not exhaust the ma-

¹ This account owes its inception to Professors A. T. Olmstead and the late Arnold Walther. The former has always been exceedingly willing to advise and to contribute from his wide knowledge of the ancient Near East. Professor Walther assumed the task of checking the translation and gave many helpful suggestions; it is regretted that he did not live to see the ultimate completion of the work. During the author's two-year residence in Turkey and Europe, where he was able to study the original documents in Istanbul and Berlin, he received a more complete understanding of the texts by talking with Professor H. G. Güterbock. Professor F. W. Geers has given many suggestions and much help from his knowledge of Akkadian materials, and Dr. I. J. Gelb has contributed many pieces of information from his assembled material. The author expresses his debt to all and gives them his greatest thanks.

² Emil Forrer, *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift*, Vol. II: *Geschichtliche Texte aus dem alten Chatti-Reich* (WVDOG, Vol. XLII [1922]), hereafter referred to as "2 BoTU." Other abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: *AJSL*, *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*; *AM*, Götze, *Die Annalen des Mursiliš*; *AO*, *Der alte Orient*; *APAW*, *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*; *ArO*, *Archiv Orientalni*; *AU*, Ferdinand Sommer, *Aḫḫiyavā Urkunden*; *BIN*, A. T. Clay, *Letters and Transactions from Cappadocia* ("Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies," Vol. IV); *BoSt*, *Boghazköi Studien*; *CCT*, *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum*; *HAB*, Ferdinand Sommer and Adam Falkenstein, *Die hethitische-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I (Labarna II)* (1939) in "Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften" (Phil.-hist. Abteilung, Neue Folge, Heft 6 [1938]); *JAOs*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*; *JEA*, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*; *JSOR*, *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*; *KBo*, *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Vols. I-VI (WVDOG, Vols. XXX, XXXVI); *KlF*, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*; *KTBl*, Julius Lewy, *Die Kültepetexte der Sammlungen Rudolf Blanckertz, Berlin*; *KTHahn*, Julius Lewy, *Die Kültepetexte aus der Sammlung Frida Hahn, Berlin*; *KTS*, Julius Lewy, *Die altassyrischen Texte vom Kültepe bei Kaisarije* ("Keilschrifttexte in der Antiken-Museen zu Stambul"); *KUB*, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*; *MAOG*, *Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft*; *MDOG*, *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*; *MVAG*, *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft*; *OIP*, University of Chicago, "Oriental Institute Publications"; *OLZ*, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*; *RA*, *Revue d'assyriologie*; *RHA*, *Revue hittite et asianique*; *SAOC*, University of Chicago, Oriental Institute, "Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization"; *TC*, *Textes cappadociennes* (3d ser., 1935-37), Parts 1-3 (Musée national du Louvre, "Textes cunéiformes," Vols. XIX-XXI); *TMH*, Julius Lewy, *Texte und Materialien der Frau Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities im Eigentum Universität Jena*; *VBoT*, *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*; *VS*, *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*; *WVDOG*, *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*; *ZA*, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.

terial, for many facts about the Old Kingdom are incorporated in other and diverse records, some of which date from the Empire period. Because many of the texts of the older period are religious documents containing historical allusions, one must exercise great care in extracting the relevant material. In the case of the more "regular" historical sources, various difficulties are encountered, chief of which are syntax and grammatical structure. Since these documents have not received the attention devoted to those from the Empire period, they are necessarily less well understood and may therefore easily be mistranslated. Only a few texts from the collection named have been translated with commentaries; many of the others have not been translated at all or only partially so in widely scattered periodicals. Hence the historian must develop his own translations, while the nonspecialist is unable to use most of the texts for this period. This history, therefore, is presented to both the nonspecialist and the professional "Hittitologist."

History begins in Anatolia at the end of the third millennium B.C. when Assyrian merchants, some decades before the appearance of the Hittites, forced their way into the plateau. There they found numerous rulers of tiny principalities, each manifesting a desire for power and a tendency to expand at the expense of his neighbor. Two kings of Kussaras, Bitḥanas and his son Anittas, exemplify this movement. By reaching out and uniting under their rule many near-by cities, they were the first, so far as we know, to create in Asia Minor a large and strong state. By so doing they established a precedent for the subsequent rise of the dynasty of Labarnas and for the spread of a Hittite kingdom³ which ultimately, after several centuries of varying fortune, intrigued successfully with the powers of the Amarna age.

Approximately three generations of Assyrian merchants lived and worked in Asia Minor at the sufferance of the native princes about 2000 B.C., when Sargon I was king of Ashur.⁴ They carried on a far-flung trade with the residents of the region and made memorandums of their transactions on clay tablets. From these documents—letters,

³ For a discussion of the beginnings of the Hittite dynasty and its connection with Anittas see pp. 185 ff.

⁴ Albrecht Götze, *Kleinasien*, pp. 66–67; I. J. Gelb, *Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity* (OIP, Vol. XXVII), pp. 8 and 64; B. Hrozný, "Assyriennes et Hittites en Asie Mineure vers 2000 av. J.-C.," *ArO*, IV (1932), 113 f.

receipts, contracts, and the other miscellany of commercial paper—we learn something of the political situation of the country. No political authority was vested in the merchant colony or emanated from the ruler of Ashur, for the dynasts of Asia Minor seem to have been quite independent and unhampered by any outside power.⁵

In order to conduct business, the merchants were organized in the *kârum*, the totality or group of the merchants, and the *wabartum*, the station or factory. In the former seems to have been vested the local legal authority for passing on the concerns of the colony and the right to hold court and give judgment when other means of settlement failed. In Asia Minor the *kârum* of Kaniš, with its *bît kârim*, seems to have been dominant, but all *kârû* apparently were subject to the will of the city of Ashur and, if need be, to the king himself.⁶

Political power in the principalities was exercised by a group of dynasts who bore the title "prince" (*rubâ'um*). From the fact that the ruler of Buruṣhadum called himself "great prince,"⁷ we may judge

⁵ Götze, *op. cit.*, pp. 70 f.; B. Landsberger, "Über die Völker Vorderasiens im dritten Jahrtausend," *ZA*, XXXV (1924), 213–38; Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 f. and nn. 135 f., with a bibliography covering all aspects of Assyrian control.

⁶ Gelb, *loc. cit.*; Götze, *op. cit.*, p. 70; Landsberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 224 f., and in "Über den Wert künftiger Ausgrabungen in der Türkei," *Belleten* (Türk Tarih Kurumu), III, sayı 10 (1939), 212. *Kârû* are known to have existed at the following places:

Buruṣhadum: many references but cf. *MVAG*, XXXV, Heft 3, 154 f., No. 332.

Durḫumid: *MVAG*, XXXIII, 315, No. 278.

Ḥaḫḫum: *KTS*, No. 47b:13 f.; *TC*, II, 74; *MVAG*, XXXIII, 252, No. 243A; *ibid.*, XXXV, 40, No. 315.

Ḥattuš: according to information supplied by Dr. Gelb from an unpublished Cappadocian tablet from Kayseri.

Ḥurama: *MVAG*, XXXIII, 271, No. 252.

Kaniš: many references but cf. G. Contenau, *Tablettes cappadociennes* (1920), Nos. 82, 95, 96.

Naḫria: *BIN*, IV, 206; *MVAG*, XXXIII, 201, No. 210.

Uršu: J. Lewy, *Studien zu den altassyrischen Texten aus Kappadokien*, p. 65, No. 9; *CCT*, Vol. I, No. 46a, b.

Waḫṣuṣana: many references but cf. *CCT*, Vol. I, No. 48.

Zalpa: E. Chantre, *Mission en Cappadoce*, No. 11:4 and rev. x + 6 f.; also an unpublished text from Kayseri now in the Ankara Ethnographic Museum (so Dr. Gelb).

Scholars look for some of these places in North Syria, especially Ḥaḫḫum, Uršu, and perhaps Ḥurama.

A *wabartum* is known to have existed at:

Badna: *KTHahn*, No. 3:4, 10, 21, 23 f.

Ḥanaknak: *TMH*, Vol. I, No. 20b:17 f.

Šalatuur: *KT Hahn*, No. 16:22; *JSOR*, XI, 117, No. 10:3 f., 20.

Tuḫpia: V. K. Shileiko, *Dokumenty Giul Tepe* (IIMK, Leningrad) Vol. I, No. 14:13.

Walama: *MVAG*, XXXIII, 321, No. 282 A1, case tablet B1f.; cf. *KTBl*, p. 32.

Zalpa: *TMH*, Vol. I, No. 21a:13.

⁷ Georges Contenau, *Trente tablettes cappadociennes*, No. 27:6.

that the sovereign of the city for a time exercised a sort of hegemony over the other princes. Later, as we shall see, the leadership was shifted from Buruṣhadum to Kussaras.⁸

Bithanas came to power about 1950⁹ in Kussaras, the main city of a typical Anatolian principality; its chief deity, regarded by Bithanas as his special protector, was one of the numerous storm-gods of Asia Minor.¹⁰ It may be that in this early period Bithanas acknowledged the suzerainty of the Great Prince of Buruṣhadum (known in Hittite records as Buruṣhandas), but, if so, he challenged the authority of that ruler when he moved out of his own territory to attack the city Nesas, the seat of another principality. The assault was made at night, and, though none of the inhabitants was harmed, Bithanas placed the ruler of the city in captivity.¹¹ At another time he inducted his son Anittas into the office of *rabi simmilti*, a term of unknown meaning but one whose significance can be judged from the fact that the date formula of some documents mention not only the *rubā'um* but also the *rabi simmilti*.¹²

⁸ The names of the princes thus far known are:

Anitta and Bithanas: Gelb, *op. cit.*, Nos. 1 and 49 A and B; Lewy, *RHA*, III, 1-8; *TC*, Vol. III, No. 214 A:19.

Labarša: Hrozný, *ArO*, IV, 114 f.

Warpa or Warpama: Hrozný, *ArO*, IV, 115; *JSOR*, XI, 139, No. 43:19; *MVAG*, XXXIII, 3, No. 3:x+9, and 183, No. 189:19; Contenau, *Tablettes cappadociennes*, No. 122:x+9 f.

Besides these names we have a list of towns in each of which a *rubā'um* ruled (see also n. 25 below):

Buruṣhadum: cf. n. 7.

Ḫaḫḫum: *CCT*, Vol. IV, No. 30a:4 f. (?)

Kaniš: *JSOR*, XI, 113, No. 4:12 f.

Nenašša: Contenau, *Tablettes cappadociennes*, No. 72:20.

Šamuḫa: *OLZ*, 1926, 756 n. 1: this is an inference from the mention of *ekallum*, "palace," in the text.

Širmija: *JSOR*, XI, 114, No. 6:1.

Timilkia: *TMH*, Vol. I, No. 24e:2 f.

Tuḫpia: Contenau, *Tablettes cappadociennes*, No. 39:4, 8.

Waḫšušana: *KTS*, No. 50c; this reference is actually to a *rubātum*.

Waḫšana: *JSOR*, XI, 119, No. 14:5.

⁹ Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 9; comments on the new and shorter chronology appear in n. 103 and Appen. C.

¹⁰ This deity is given as ^dISKUR. Several writers have pointed out the equation with Zashapanas (cf. F. Sommer-H. Ehelolf, "Das hethitischen Ritual des Papanikri," *BoSt*, X [1924], 48 f.; Benjamin Schwartz, "Ritual of Zarpiya of Kezzuwatna," *JAOS*, LVIII [1938], 349; Giuseppe Furlani, *La Religione degli Hittiti* [1936], p. 35).

¹¹ 2 *BoTU* 7:1-9. Unless otherwise noted the story of Bithanas and Anittas is from this document plus 2 *BoTU* 30 and the fragment published in transliteration by H. Otten in *MDOG*, LXXVI (April, 1938), 44 f.

¹² J. Lewy, "La Chronologie de Bithana et d'Anitta de Kussara," *RHA*, III (1934-36), 1 f.; *TC*, III, 214A. The title has been translated "chief of the citadel" (Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 52),

When Anittas succeeded his father, he held only Kussaras and Nesas and claimed merely the title "prince" or "king," but during his reign his kingdom increased, and he felt himself important enough to assume the title "great prince" or "great king."¹³ Although he may have built up the first unified kingdom and inaugurated the first bid for supremacy in Asia Minor, it does not appear probable that the kingdom he created was a large one, for his sway did not pass uncontested by the neighboring principalities, and, with the possible exception of Buruṣhadum, his conquests, where they can be checked, do not seem to have penetrated beyond the central plateau.¹⁴

After his accession Anittas turned first to the lands east of his city. According to his own boast, he conquered in one year (perhaps one year after his father died) all the lands in which the sun rose. Moving

and "grand de l'escalier" (Lewy, *RHA*, III, 1). Two other men bearing the same title are known; one is Ḫalgiašu, who occupied the office under the prince Warpa (*MVAG*, XXXIII, 3, No. 3:x+10; p. 183, No. 189:19 f.; *JSOR*, XI, 134, No. 43:19 f.; Contenau, *Tablettes cappadociennes*, No. 122:x+15 f.; Hrozný, *ArO*, IV, 114 f.); the other is Beruwa, an official of Anittas (Gelb, *op. cit.*, No. 49A:25).

¹³ Gelb, *op. cit.*, Nos. 1 and 49 A and B. The chronicle of his reign shows that his early years were occupied in establishing his rule over the surrounding kings; consequently, it seems very unlikely that he could have claimed the title of "great king" for some time. Louis Delaporte (*Les Hittites*, p. 58) thinks that Anittas assumed the title after he had defeated Zalpas.

¹⁴ Location of the cities mentioned may be hazarded from the following somewhat tentative analysis of the movements of Anittas and Biṭhanas. The first place attacked, Nesas, must have been adjacent to Kussaras. Since Anittas' first conquests were eastward, those which took place subsequently should presumably be in the opposite direction, or west of Kussaras; therefore, Ullammas, Hatti, and Salammnas ought not to be far from Nesas and Kussaras. Before Anittas' time a ruler of Zalpas had carried off the god Siusmis from Nesas; to make such a raid possible, these two cities must be adjacent. Before taking Hattusas, Anittas first had to deal with Zalpas; which may have been either between Nesas and Hattusas, or to one side of Nesas, in a position to threaten the rear or flank; as Anittas conquered the territory from Zalpas to the sea (Tüz Gölü? cf. n. 19), the latter suggestion is more probably correct. Zalpas, mentioned in a list of cities as the second after Hattusas (*KBo* IV 13 i 20 f.), could not have been far away. Contrary to Götze, "Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Texten AO 9608 des Louvre," *RHA*, I (1930-32), 27 f., who would suggest Çorum, we may need to look for the site in the direction of Kırşehir. Salatiwaras' location is still doubtful (Hrozný, *ArO*, I, 291, identifies it with Savatra, but this would seem rather to agree with Suwatara mentioned by Hattusilis III; cf. Götze, *MVAG*, XXIX, Heft 3, 16, col. ii 13), but the city must have been near the river Hulas between Salatiwaras and Nesas.

The location of Kussaras is not settled, but the author believes it must ultimately be equated with Alişar (whose identification with Ankuwas has never seemed quite satisfactory). He agrees in general with Landsberger that one must look for Kussaras near Hattusas (*Belleten*, III, 213 f.). On the other hand, Hrozný, *ArO*, I (1929), 286, wishes to identify Kussaras with Kursaura, mentioned in the text of Naram-Sins's exploits (*2 BoTU* 3:15), and thus with the city Γαρσαουρα of the Greco-Roman period and the modern Ak-saray; however, he has difficulties with this proposal and gives Gavurkalesi as an alternate. Cf. also Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 9, and *AJSL*, LII, 135, for further comments on the identification of the latter site.

next in another direction, he fought with Ullammas and Hatti. The latter city seems already to have been involved militarily with Anittas, who declared: "The king of Hatti came back."¹⁵ Our damaged source does not permit us to say what happened to either contestant, but we may guess the engagement ended successfully for Anittas. He now turned against the cities of Harkiu¹⁶ and . . . -as, which fell before him in the "warm time" (i.e., probably in the early afternoon),¹⁷ and the city . . . -mas, which succumbed in a night attack. The next moves are not clear, but Anittas seems to have bestowed certain cities on the storm-god of Nesas, following which he inscribed and set up in the gate an imprecation against the cities he had just destroyed and placed a curse upon anyone who would mutilate his record.¹⁸ He next had a contest with Zalpas, but what happened is not

¹⁵ *MDOG*, LXXVI, 44, plus 2 *BoTU* 7:14. Hrozný, *ArO*, I, 288 and 277, has another translation and explanation of these events, but the interpretation given here removes a number of difficulties. Hrozný's supposition that Anittas had had previous relations with Hatti, based on l. 36, is confirmed by l. 14 plus the new fragment given in *MDOG*, LXXVI, 44 f., which implies that even this was not the first conflict between the two kings. The translation from which the interpretation of an eastward movement has been taken was suggested to the author by Professor H. G. Güterbock.

¹⁶ Or, perhaps better, Murkiunas, a reading suggested by Gelb. Some doubt may be cast upon the arrangement and the translation in context of the names of cities in this part of the document, but nothing better can yet be worked out.

¹⁷ It is unlikely that the "warm time" refers to summer. In Anatolia this season would be the only one in which to campaign, for during any other time the inclement weather or muddy roads would prevent activities, and mention of the season would be superfluous. Hence in this part of the text an attempt seems to have been made to form a contrast between the cities taken in the daytime and the one taken at night.

¹⁸ The Anittas tablet, which is our main source of information for Bitḫanas and Anittas, appears to be a chronicle compiled from several sources and may not have been written in its present form by Anittas. The first paragraph begins in the third person, and its story is continued into the second paragraph. Then follows an account in the first person which is taken from the monument which Anittas erected in the gate of Nesas and which is the source for the information recounted above. Other possible strands in the story may be pointed out as those of Hattusas, Zalpas, and Salatiwaras. The latter account is divided by the story of Anittas' building activities and is told partly in the first and partly in the third person singular. The closing paragraph of the text is written in the first person and may be labeled the Burushandas story.

In its present form it is difficult to see anything but a composite text which may or may not have had quite as many sources as suggested here. The fact that it is preserved in Hittite does not appear to make necessary the assumption that the original language was Hittite or that Anittas himself was a Hittite. In this connection it should be pointed out that the political situation portrayed by the tablet is similar to that of the period of the Assyrian merchants, and the fact that Anittas is known from "Cappadocian" documents seems to indicate he preceded the Hittites. As will be mentioned again later, the fact that Telepinus began his chronicle with Labarnas shows that he was the initiator of the Hittite dynastic tradition. Further and cogent arguments about the Anittas document are given by Güterbock, in "Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonern und Hethitern," *ZA*, XLIV (1938), 139 f. A contrary opinion is held by Götze, who maintains there was no break in tradition or culture between the time of Anittas and the dynasty of Labarnas and implies the contemporaneity of Anittas' account (cf. *AJA*, XLII [1938], 184 f.).

known. Trouble started anew with Hattusas, the capital of Hatti, for Anittas' expansion was a threat to the ruler of that city, and, although the two kings had come to blows at least once before, the struggle between Anittas and Piustis, the prince of Hatti, had been indecisive. In this renewed action Piustis took the initiative and marched against Anittas; he and his allies were defeated, however, and his soldiers were killed in the city of Salamnās.

Before he could follow up this victory, Anittas had to dispose of Zalpas, which remained a disturbing element. All the countries between Zalpas and the sea were first subjugated.¹⁹ Then he was able to avenge an act of an earlier king of Zalpas, Uhnas, who had attacked Nesas and carried its god Siusmis (or Siusumis) back with him to Zalpas. Anittas now took the city, retrieved the god, and bore it together with the king, Huzziyas, to Nesas. With his path thus opened, Anittas was able to move against Hattusas. Apparently he now laid siege to it and, when hunger had weakened the city, stormed it in a night attack, systematically destroyed it, sowed the site to cress, and placed a curse of death upon any king who in future times should rebuild it. How well this curse was respected we shall see later. Salatiwaras, undaunted by the fate of so many other cities which had fallen before Anittas, assumed so inimical an attitude that Anittas was obliged to march against it. He defeated the hostile army and carried it away to Nesas.

For a time Anittas forsook warlike activities and turned his attention to peaceful pursuits. Nesas, which seems to have become the capital of the kingdom after its capture by Bithanas, was enlarged by adding other cities or villages to its environs; the sanctuaries of the storm-god of heaven, of the gods Siusmis, Siunasumis, and Halmasuitas, and of the storm-god whom Anittas regarded as his patron deity, were built. When the work was completed, Anittas deposited the spoils of his campaigns in the new temples, and everything was dedicated with prayers. The amount of such booty was probably not very great, for, as we have indicated, Anittas' conquests could not have extended far. Difficult to interpret is an additional episode in connection with building and consecrating the temples, for the extant copies

¹⁹ Is this sea the Mediterranean, or is it one of the large salt lakes of Anatolia? If our supposition that Anittas' kingdom was confined to the center of Anatolia is correct, the Mediterranean is excluded, especially if we look for Zalpas somewhere near Hattusas and Kussaras. The modern Tüz Gölü is probably the "sea" meant.

of our source conflict with each other. It would seem that after Anittas had gone on a hunting expedition, during which lions, pigs, a boar, bears, goats and wild goats, and leopards (or some member of the cat family) were taken, he bestowed his kill on the gods.

Within a year the ruler of Salatiwaras rebelled and, moving his forces from his own city and country, seized the river Hulas,²⁰ which he held as a barrier against Anittas. The latter, with his army, encircled and burned the villages of the rebellious ruler who presumably had to return to protect his own city. The remainder of the action is very uncertain, but we conclude that the ruler of Salatiwaras placed warriors around his city to protect it—an act which was apparently of no avail, for either booty or tribute of chariots, horses,²¹ and a quantity of silver seems to have come into Anittas' hands. If this were tribute, the ruler of Salatiwaras may have been allowed to withdraw peacefully; if it were booty, we can assume the man was defeated and, though perhaps not captured, forced to retreat.

Burushandas next received Anittas' attention. From the fact that its ruler is designated not as king but as the "man of Burushandas,"²² we infer that some previous action had broken his power and placed him in submission to Anittas. As tokens of his friendship the ruler of the city presented Anittas with an iron throne and other small iron objects.²³ When Anittas returned to Nesas from what seems to have

²⁰ Perhaps this river occurs in *KBo* IV 10 obv. 20, and 2 *BoTU* 23A iii 32; cf. L. A. Mayer and John T. Garstang, *Index of Hittite Names* (1923), p. 22.

²¹ One text (2 *BoTU* 30:14 = *KUB* XXVI 71) preserves the number 1,400 warriors but does not give the number of chariots, whereas the other text (2 *BoTU* 7:71 = *KBo* III 22) preserves 40 teams of horses, but the number of warriors is broken away.

²² The general meaning of this designation in Akkadian sources seems uncertain, but in Hittite records and especially here in Anittas' text it can refer only to a subject ruler. The phrase is used elsewhere to designate a ruler of Salatiwaras known to have been placed in subjection, but who is said to have rebelled; obviously such a man cannot possibly be considered in any other way than as dependent; hence, when the ruler of Burushandas, who does not seem to be acting as a peer of Anittas, is designated in the same way, one can only assume he too was dependent.

²³ Mention of iron in Anittas' time needs some comment. Bittel (*APAW* [Phil.-hist. Klasse (1935), No. 1], p. 13, n. 1) believes an iron throne at this period is archeologically out of the question. We stand by the document until the nonexistence of iron has been proved or until the word in our sources has been shown to be the addition of a late copyist. The same type of objection might also be raised in connection with horses referred to in 2 *BoTU* 30:14, but they are mentioned in texts of this period from Cappadocia, Mari, and Chagar Bazar; cf. Dossin, "Aplahanda, Roi de Carkémiš," *RA*, XXXV (1938), 120; C. J. Gadd, "The Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tell Brak," *Iraq*, VII (1940), 31; and W. F. Albright, "New Light on the History of Western Asia in the Second Millennium B.C.," *BASOR*, No. 77 (February, 1940), p. 31.

been a friendly and perhaps merely a routine administrative visit, he took with him his subject ruler, apparently as a guest. During the latter's stay in the capital, he accompanied Anittas to the holy place in the temple²⁴ and occupied a position of honor on Anittas' right.²⁵

With this event our sources for the history cease, and the silence which now descends upon the history of Asia Minor is unbroken until the reign of Labarnas several decades later. The story of the two reigns just recounted is that of rulers of Anatolian principalities of the period of the Assyrian merchant colonies. We have seen numerous dynasts at war with each other, and the emergence of one man, Anittas, who was able to impose his rule over the neighboring states. Burushandas, the only other city which seems to have been able successfully to establish its rule over adjacent principalities, must have been subjected to Nesas. The significant fact about Anittas' expansion is that it started a movement toward the consolidation of power to which later kings looked back and with which they claimed spiritual connection. To gain prestige by asserting relationship with the past, at least one king of the Empire deemed it essential to call himself "King of Kussar."²⁶ Perhaps as an ancient saga which was looked upon as covering the beginnings of their own history, the narrative of Anittas was kept alive and read by the people of the Empire.

When the history of Anatolia can again be followed, a new dynasty is found governing the territory from Hattusas. This new line we seem

²⁴ Var., Zalpas.

²⁵ Anittas' relations with the ruler of Burushandas raises the question as to what happened to the principality of Burushadum and the hegemony once exercised over surrounding states which is indicated by a document from the time of the Assyrian merchants. Landsberger (*Bellefen*, III, 213 f.) postulates in this period two rival organizations—one at Kussaras, the other at Burushandas. Anittas, however, refers to the ruler not as "king" but as "the man of Burushandas," a phrase which has already been considered as implying subordination.

A few comments may here be made on the title, LUGAL, used for the other rulers mentioned in the Anittas text. We believe the word designates the same kind of ruler as does *rubā'um*. The title LUGALGAL, therefore, is the same as *rubā'um rabum*; this view is substantiated by comparing the title of Anittas in the so-called *Annals* with the title found in a tablet from Alişar (cf. Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 50, No. 49A:25 and B:27). Thus with these titles equated, the proposition can be set up that the cities mentioned by Anittas as having LUGAL'S can be added to the cities from the Assyrian merchants' documents which name *rubā'ū* (see above, n. 8); hence Hattusas, Zalpas, Nesas, Kussaras, and possibly Salatiwaras can be added. Three cities of this list furnish names of rulers: Bithanas and Anittas of Kussaras, Uhnas and Huzziyas of Zalpas, and Piustis of Hatti. If our supposition is correct, six of the ten *kārū* now have *rubā'ū* in their cities; thus we may wonder whether each city governed by a *rubā'um* also possessed a *kārum*, and vice versa.

²⁶ A. Götze, "Hattušiliš," *M VAG*, XXIX, Heft 3 (1925), 6.

compelled to distinguish from that which ruled at Kussaras. It is unlikely that any descendant of Anittas' house would have rebuilt and taken for his capital a city which was so stalwart a foe of Kussaras and on which Anittas had placed a deadly curse. Further, Telepinus, who gives the main outlines of Hittite history in his apologia, considers Labarnas, while possibly not the dynasty's founder, at least the founder of the dynastic tradition and power at Hattusas. This we infer to mean lack of connection with any earlier dynasty. Furthermore, certain documents bearing the name of Anittas and Bithanas belong to the class of texts which come from the time of the Assyrian merchants and which portray a situation different from the one seen during the time of Labarnas. These tablets have so far elicited few, if any, uncontested traces of a population using an Indo-European language; consequently, we cannot prove that a sufficient number of such people was then present to set up their own dynasty. Bithanas and Anittas must, therefore, have belonged to an older (possibly Hattic) and different group from the one represented by the kings who in later times resided at Hattusas and must not be considered, as has been done, members of the Hittite dynasty, while Labarnas' house is considered in this article as Hittite and thus as using an Indo-European language. When the founders of the new line entered Asia Minor and whence they came, we cannot tell, though they may have entered simultaneously with the disappearance of the Assyrian merchants from Anatolian affairs.

The dynasty of Hattusas, gathering its impetus from Labarnas, brought to an end the independent rule of local dynasts, who, however, were frequently left to govern their states. Finally, when it gained control of eastern Anatolia and part of the Mediterranean Sea coast, the dynasty was in a position to attack Mesopotamia.

Labarnas' father, perhaps the first of the dynasty to rule at Hattusas, sent his son to govern the disaffected city Sanahuittas. The chief men of the city, however, formed a conspiracy, set Papadilmahas on the throne, and drove Labarnas out. When the rebellion was put down, the houses of the conspirators were destroyed.²⁷

²⁷ 2 *BoTU* 8 iii 41-45, with restoration of the word *labarnas* in the text, which can be assigned to the time of Hattusilis I. The reference to "my grandfather" means, therefore, the grandfather of Hattusilis, and "his son [. . . -a]rnas applies to the king Labarnas.

The restoration in *HAB*, p. 12, l. 41, of the name ³⁰Pu-LUGAL-ma, is extremely prob-

Before embarking on a campaign of expansion after his accession to the throne, Labarnas brought unity and order to his land. The formula, stating that his sons, brothers, the relatives of his wife, his own relatives, and his warriors were united, contrasts markedly with the later period of disunity and weakness which preceded Telepinus. Labarnas added new lands to the kingdom by extending his sway to the seacoast²⁸ and by annexing Arzawas and Wilusas to his realm. Arzawas later revolted and was recovered, but Wilusas never forsook its allegiance to the king of the Hittites.²⁹

If the actions of the city Zalpas may be taken as typical of this period, we can see how the little principalities of Asia Minor were incorporated into the expanding Hittite realm. At first the city had made peace, which may mean that Zalpas became a vassal of Hatti, retaining its own king. Its ruler, as a sign of his subjection, apparently had married a daughter³⁰ of the Hittite monarch; but later, as the first act of rebellion, she was killed. The Hittite king naturally demanded an explanation and declared war on his contumacious vassal. A battle seems to have taken place on the mountain Kapassas, and Alluwas, steward of the Zalpaeian ruler, was slain. Something was done to Zalpas itself, after which a number of individuals were settled in the city Tawiniyas.³¹

lematical, as it is based on a dubious passage in 2 *BoTU* 25 i 10-11. The single sign on which the name Labarnas is restored, and on which the relationship between Pu-LUGAL-ma and Labarnas is set up, is fragmentary and can be *at*, or several others, as well as *la*. Furthermore, to take this as the beginning of a personal name seems doubtful, for no determinative accompanies it. All the names in the text, whether of men or of women, are preceded by the appropriate determinative. Another thing that should be borne in mind is that Labarnas was displaced at Sanahuittas by Papadilmahas. Although this man's name is very like Pawatelmah, who is related in some way to Pu-LUGAL-ma, it does not seem likely that a man who betrayed the interests of the dynasty as he did would be remembered by later kings in their offering lists even though he belonged to the royal family. In addition, one may call attention to the fact that a Pu-LUGAL-rum is known from a later text and possibly the same man is again called Pu-LUGAL-rum-ma (*KBo* IV 14 iii 40; *KUB* VII 61 vs. 8 f.; cf. also *HAB*, p. 163, n. 1). Possibly we should equate Pu-LUGAL-ma of 2 *BoTU* 25 with the similar names in the texts just mentioned and not with Papadilmahas or Labarnas.

²⁸ 2 *BoTU* 23A i 8.

²⁹ J. Friedrich, "Staatverträge des Hatti-Reiches, II," *MVAG*, XXXIV, Heft 1 (1930), 50, ll. 2-13.

³⁰ Contrary view, *HAB*, pp. 135 and 213, n. 1.

³¹ 2 *BoTU* 13 i 7-17. This text shows certain similarities in style with 2 *BoTU* 12A (cf. Güterbock, *ZA*, XLIV, 104), which has been assigned for various reasons to the time of Hattusilis I, although it probably was not written until the time of Mursilis I. Consequently, 2 *BoTU* 13 must belong about the same time. As Güterbock pointed out, three

For administration, Labarnas organized his enlarged kingdom into provinces which were centered around the cities Hubisnas (Cybistra), Tuwanuwas (Tyana), Nenassas (Ninassos), Landas (Laranda), Zallaras (Zoldera?),³² Parsuhantas, and Lusnas (Lystra). If the identifications of these cities are correct, Labarnas controlled, in addition to his homeland, a territory parallel to the north side of the Taurus Mountains, extending west from Tyana as far as the region around the present city of Konya and north to the salt plain in the middle of the plateau.³³ The governors placed over the cities in this area were the sons of the king himself,³⁴ who were thus in a position to lend strength to the dynasty and at the same time to contest the authority of the king, should occasion arise. For the time being, strong rulers were able to hold this tendency in check. The strength of Labarnas was such that a later king declared that neither Labarnas nor his successor, Hattusilis I, had ever allowed certain foes to cross the Kumesmahas River.³⁵

About 1800 B.C. Hattusilis I succeeded Labarnas. Everything in the kingdom "was harmonious, and on whatever campaign he went,

generations of kings are named in the text; the first, according to the only system possible in the Old Kingdom, would be Labarnas (the grandfather); the second, Hattusilis (the father); the third, Mursilis (the king). *HAB*, p. 24 (and possibly Götze, *AO*, XXVII, 16), assigns the document to the time of a king Labarnas or Tabarnas, for, contrary to our view, he sees only one ruler in the document.

³² See n 33.

³³ The cities can be divided into two sections; first Hubisnas, Tuwanuwas, and Nenassas, going from west to east; the second group is from east to west: Landas, Zallaras, Parsuhantas, and Lusnas (cf. the writing LVSTRA in an official Latin inscription which is one of many instances where Greek upsilon is rendered by Latin *u*; see J. R. S. Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, p. 142). Thus, while there is no identification for Parsuhantas, we may look for it between Lusnas and Landas. The identification of Zallaras with Zoldera is not completely satisfactory for it lay south of Konya, thus breaking the east-west line; consequently, it is possible that one should look for Zallaras west of Landas in the same direction as Parsuhantas and Lusnas. Parsuhantas may be equated with Buruṣhadum or Buruṣhandas. Hrozný, *ArO*, IV, 114, says Buruṣhadum could not have been far from Kaniš and may be identified with Caesarea (Kayseri), whereas Landsberger, *Beleiten*, pp. 213 f., places it in the territory of Niğde. The above-mentioned observation would necessitate locating it farther westward. One must recognize the complete equation as still questionable, for the first sign of the name as given here may be read *maš* instead of *pár*, producing Massuhantas. For the identification of the cities cf. E. Forrer, "Das südliche Hatti-Land," *Forschungen*, I, Heft 1 (1926), 35-44. For the classical sites cf. W. M. Ramsay, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, pp. 332, 336, 341, 346, 385; for the roads on which the cities lay cf. pp. 357 f. and 51 f. A. H. Sayce ("The Geographical Position of Arzawa," *JEA*, VIII [1922], 233-34) and A. T. Olmstead ("Near East Problems in the Second Pre-Christian Millennium," *JEA*, VIII [1922], 226) identify Nenassas with Ninassos.

³⁴ 2 *BoTU* 23A i 1-11.

³⁵ *KUB* XXI 29 ii 4 f.

he also held the enemy land in subjection by (his) strength." Like his predecessor he controlled lands which extended to the seacoast, and "when he returned from a campaign, then one of his sons went to each country, and the great cities were placed in his hands."³⁶ Unfortunately, the only events of the reign which can be arranged chronologically are those which happened at its end, when the king lay ill. We do learn of revolts, but the kingdom remained intact and actually expanded for the first time outside the confines of Asia Minor; throughout Hattusilis' reign and that of his son, one could perhaps speak of an "Old Hittite Empire" but thereafter, torn by dynastic strife, the dynasty declined in power and was confined to its kingdom in Anatolia.

One document in particular gives us an excellent glimpse of the chief men and cities and of the internal affairs of the kingdom. This text mentions Arzawas as part of the realm and names twelve cities—some of which were administrative centers earlier under Labarnas. Those which can be identified show only the extent of the kingdom within Asia Minor. Hubisnas, which temporarily held a garrison, and Nenassas were important. Kussaras apparently was only a royal residence at this time. Hurmas, under the direct control of the king, was the seat of a governor who may possibly have supervised the governor of Ullammas (at least we find one instance when that happened). Hassuwas³⁷ and Ankuwas were administered similarly by the king who moved their officials at will from place to place. The status of Ussas, Huntaras, Kuzurus, Pakummaliyas, and Sugziyas is unknown, but if we may project back into this period information from a later time, we can probably say that Sugziyas, at least, retained its own ruler.

³⁶ 2 *BoTU* 23A i 13–20.

³⁷ Equated with Isuwas and placed in the region of Harput-Elaziz by E. F. Weidner, "Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien," *BoSt*, VIII, 4, n. 5. Albright (*BASOR*, No. 78, p. 28), who says it is either to the north of Aleppo toward Maraş or in the region of Commagene, indicates a location not greatly dissimilar; although his association of Hürama-Khurmu with Hassuwas may be correct, the evidence he cites is inconclusive.

The author is not entirely convinced of the equation of Hassuwas and Isuwas, although the latter country seems to be correctly placed (cf. also A. T. Olmstead, "Shalmaneser III and the Establishment of the Assyrian Power," *JAOS*, XLI [1921], 359, n. 31, and M. Streck in *Babyloniaca*, II [1907–8], 245 f.); such an equation extends the Old Kingdom farther east than we are permitted by the available evidence. A more complete identification of these places, as is generally true of Hittite geography, must await a more comprehensive study than so far has been undertaken. In this paper comments are often given on geographical material, but it must be understood they are extended with full appreciation of the complexity of the problem and are often no more than working hypotheses.

The individuals mentioned in the text³⁸ are the dignitaries of the kingdom, and the stories told about them explain the manner in which they fulfilled their duties. Because the document is broken, we have lost parts of the story narrated about certain individuals. These we can mention only in passing. Pappas was a *uriyannis*-man who distributed the *marnuwanza*-drink³⁹ and the bread of the warriors in the city . . . -kimas.⁴⁰ Hanis was lord of Hassuwas and Ewarisatunis was butler there; Ispudahsus became chief of the princes, but Habruzis, who is mentioned with him, is unidentified. Kilentius was the king's son,⁴¹ and Nakkilid was made "chief of the wine"; Hakibudis seemingly was made steward; Nunnus was the brother of a man from the city Pakummaliyas; Kuhsis and Tazzis are merely named.⁴²

The stories which follow are brief accounts of happenings during the reign of Hattusilis and stand without relationship to other events of the period. Occasionally the impression is given that the incidents narrated cover more than one king's lifetime, for apparently the events, begun under "the father of the king," were finished only under his successor, who caused the stories to be told.

We begin our anecdotes with another Nunnus, a resident (or ruler?) of Hurmas, who was in Arzawas, apparently as an agent of the king. He seems to have diverted property not his own to his personal use and was exposed by a man of the city Huntaras who was perhaps of similar status. Hattusilis ordered Nunnus "brought up" (probably to the court) and sent Sarmassus to Hurmas; but Sarmassus delayed his departure, so the king dispatched "the bearer of the golden ensign," an official of unknown duties. The latter, seizing both Nunnus and

³⁸ All in 2 *BoTU* 12A, B, C. The text was written by a king to recount the events which occurred in his father's reign. Since the name of the woman Histayar, who is known from the last of Hattusilis' rule, occurs, we can assume that it is his son, Mursilis I, who narrated stories about the days when his father was king. The short anecdotes, written in difficult Hittite, are frequently hard to understand and interpret.

³⁹ This may be a ritualistic drink, for in Bo 2544 ii 18 (H. Ehelolf, "Hethitische akkadische Wortgleichungen," *ZA*, XLIII [1936], 176) it is mixed with beer to be given to the sun-god of the gods.

⁴⁰ The story about Pappas is incomplete. It would seem that he committed an unrighteous act in Hattusas and was requited there by having the warriors to whom he gave *walhi*-drink break a *sakkas*-vessel on his head. The additional fragment to 2 *BoTU* 12A published by H. Ehelolf in *MDOG*, LXXV (1937), 63 does not fill all the breaks in paragraph 2; hence Pappas' misdemeanor is not now known.

⁴¹ He was "brother of the king"; hence the brother of Mursilis I and son of Hattusilis

⁴² All from 2 *BoTU* 12A, B, C.

Sarmassus, had them carried to the mountain Tahayas where he harnessed them to oxen.⁴³ When relatives of Nunnus' wife had been seized, they were bewitched before the eyes of Nunnus and Sarmassus. The next day before dawn the king came and demanded, "Who led these away? Because their clothes and their headbands are not bound (?)." To this question the *Mešidi* people answered, "Their garment (is) put on and (their) clothes they took away." The king⁴⁴ then saw for the first time the blood which had been spilled. Sarmassus, apparently to excuse his lack of haste in carrying out the king's desire, addressed him, but the king replied: "Go (to)! You arranged (?) this (?) (yourself)."

Sandas, a prince and a native of Hurmas, was apparently an official in Hassuwas. He feared an invasion of the Hurri people⁴⁵ who seem to have been harassing him, but, instead of staying to meet the incursion, Sandas withdrew to his superior in the district. When this neglect of duty reached the ears of Hattusilis, he sent word and had Sandas killed.

Zidis, we are told, was a butler. Now Hattusilis had apportioned a wine *harharas*-vessel to Hastayaras⁴⁶ and Marattis. Zidis gave the proper wine to the king, but some people made a substitution of the wine which was to be given to Hastayaras and Marattis. The latter informed the king of the fact, saying, "They gave other wine." The king acted on this accusation and had Zidis imprisoned. "They led him away; they executed him; he died."

Asgaliyas, lord of Hurmas, a very competent official and generally praised by the residents of the city, was summoned by the king and

⁴³ This strange punishment may be somewhat clarified by § 166 in the law code (see A. Walther, in J. M. P. Smith, *The Origin and History of Hebrew Law* [1931], p. 268). The sowing of "seed upon seed" reminds one of the Hebrew prohibition against sowing two kinds of seeds together (cf. Deut. 22:9, and Lev. 19:19).

⁴⁴ In l. 19 the phrase "the father of the king" occurs, but in l. 22 is found only the word "king." It is uncertain whether one or two persons are meant here, but once having specified the king who was meant, it is likely that an abbreviated means of reference was used; therefore, it does not seem probable that we have to do with father and son in this account.

⁴⁵ This is the earliest mention in a Hittite source of these people. For references to them in Old Hittite sources cf. the list supplied by the author for R. M. Engberg, *The Hyksos Reconsidered* (SAOC, XVIII [1940], 47, n. 30).

⁴⁶ This woman is mentioned in 2 *BoTU* 8 iii 64, iv 64; 11a:16; 12C:11; and *VBoT* 33:8. The name is found as Hastayar, Hastayaris, Histayaras, and Hestaya [-l. .]; cf. also p. 198.

appointed steward in Ankuwas, but the man did not long enjoy his new post. "He was a mighty man, but he died in shame; in the city Kuzurus he cut up *kakkabus*, (and) in Ankuwas the *kakkabus* (were) thin." A second episode is told of Asgaliyas, who, wishing to kill Ispudas-Inaras, a *hupralas*-man⁴⁷ appointed governor of Ullammas (var. Uдахsumis), imprisoned him. Word arose against Asgaliyas, and the prisoner on being released indicated his would-be captor as follows: "You (are) corrupt; you disgrace the king greatly." The king then made Ispudas-Inaras overseer(?)⁴⁸ to the squires Subbiumas and Marassus and decreed, "At night he shall await them for war(?)." When these two men had been found, the barbers⁴⁹ purified a chair for each one and placed each man before his *ukitis*. The king ordered further, "At night they shall summon, and he shall place each of my excellent squires on horses, then Ispudas-Inaras shall assign them the opening of the knife(?) and the taking of arms." Hattusilis divided the group of squires into three sections and gave them, for training, to Nakkilid, chief of the cup-bearers, Huzzis, chief of the smiths, and Kizzuis, chief of the *Mešidi*, and "they made them skilful." A training rule stipulated that one of the duties of the recruits was to sleep before the king; whoever performed his duty(?)⁵⁰ was to be given wine to drink, but whoever neglected it was to be given *iyara* in a vessel and, naked, must avoid being seen.

Besides the stories of these men and their actions, which seem to be both military and political, there are accounts of four individuals who were occupied with sacrificial affairs. Favorite sons of Hattusilis were Ammunas of the city Sugziyas and Bimbirid of Nenassas, for each of whom a chair, a sacrificial table, and a trencher(?) were set up. Likewise the last two articles were arranged for a man of Ussas and for Ispudahsus(?) of Hubisnas.⁵¹

⁴⁷ *Hupralas* may be connected with *huppar*, "large jar," or with *huprus*, "an article of clothing," and be used to designate a functionary concerned with overseeing or directing the use of the object.

⁴⁸ The word *urallas* might be connected with the root *au-*, *u-*, "see, observe," and with the word *auriyallas*, "a member of a frontier garrison, sentry post," hence the tentative translation "overseer."

⁴⁹ The barbers, among other duties, swept the floor of the temple (cf. H. Ehelolf, "Zum hethitische Lexikon," *KlF*, I, No. 1 [1927], 147).

⁵⁰ The proposed translation of E. H. Sturtevant, "Values of the *be*-sign in Hittite," *Language*, XIII (1937), 287 f., has been accepted.

⁵¹ The entire collection of stories is from 2 *BoTU* 12A, B, C.

Perhaps as a result of the settlement of people in Tawiniyas,⁵² Zalpas again became dissatisfied but was influenced to make peace by some subsequent action in Tawiniyas; hence it admitted someone into the city from Gulbinas who perhaps had acted as its intermediary in Hattusas. When peace was restored, the Hittite king addressed Zalpas, pointing out an act of Hurmas which must have been hostile to Hattusas. In reply, the elders of Zalpas seem to have demanded a son of the king; consequently, he sent Hakkarpilis as their ruler. In the city, Hakkarpilis declared against his father by saying to the people of Zalpas: "He (i.e., the king) holds evil. Now seize hostility. . . ." Kiswas replied for the people of Zalpas, but the subsequent story is not preserved.⁵³

During the reign of Hattusilis I the Hittites made their first attack on North Syria. Aleppo was not only a great cult center for Adad⁵⁴ but was also one of the great kingdoms of this region⁵⁵—in fact, of all Upper Mesopotamia—and was named in the correspondence of Mari. The kingdom Yamhad, which centered in Aleppo, controlled twenty kings and shortly before our period was governed by rulers named Hammurapi and Yarimlim.⁵⁶ Now, however, the Hittites, descending from their highlands, attacked the city and established the land as a vassal kingdom. Sometime prior to the rebellion of the sons of the king, Aleppo began a revolt which Hattusilis was unable to suppress before his death.⁵⁷

In Asia Minor the cities of Tibiyas, Hasbinas, and Parduwas came within the realm of the king's activities. Although the exact nature of the work done by him cannot be ascertained, it seems that two men, Zaharadus and Zahares, along with a garrison of three thousand warriors, were left in Tibiyas—which must have been a

⁵² Cf. p. 187 and n. 31.

⁵³ One wonders if this were not one of the events connected with the rebellion of the princes and of the *labarnas*-son.

⁵⁴ G. Dossin, "Les Archives épistolaire du Palais de Mari," *Syria*, XIX (1938), 115, n. 3.

⁵⁵ In the time of Zimrilim of Mari, Aleppo or the country of Yamhad is specified as one of the five great kingdoms of western Asia (Dossin, *Syria*, XIX, 117; Albright, *BASOR*, No. 77 [February, 1940], p. 32).

⁵⁶ G. Dossin, "Les Archives économiques du Palais de Mari," *Syria*, XX (1939), 109, and n. 3, and *Syria*, XIX, 117; Charles-F. Jean, "Hammurapi d'après les lettres inédites de Mari," *RA*, XXXV (1938), 113; Dossin, "Jamhad et Qatanum," *RA*, XXXVI (1939), 47 f.; and Albright, *BASOR*, No. 77, p. 32.

⁵⁷ For a discussion of the sources see Appen. A.

large town if that many troops could be quartered there. The king apportioned cattle, sheep, and vineyards and made a settlement in Parduwas and Hasbinas. As soon as the task was accomplished he returned to Hattusas and Arinnas. In the second year after his return he sent the "chief of the wine," also named Hattusilis,⁵⁸ to the city Takkumita[. . . (?)]. Its cattle and sheep were driven away to Parduwas. The "chief of the wine" then went to the city Sahhuilas⁵⁹ and apparently took its cattle and sheep. Following this, the warriors in Tibiyas surrendered, and Hattusilis was free to turn his attention elsewhere. He occupied all the land to the borders of the sea and then turned against Hahhas, whose inhabitants fled before him.⁶⁰ In this story we see a Hittite king apparently transplanting populations and herds to break the power of antagonistic cities and by means of friendly foundations building or enlarging cities to oppose hostile communities. The transference of populations is well enough known among the Assyrians and imperial Hittites, but this is the first indication of its use by the rulers of the Old Kingdom.⁶¹

A revolt in which the subjects of the princes and several cities took part broke the internal harmony of the royal family and the kingdom. "But afterwards the subjects of the princes became rebellious; then their houses they began to despoil, and they began to conspire continually against their masters and to shed their blood."⁶² The prince⁶³ who had been set before the nobles as the king's successor and who had

⁵⁸ This name is found in Cappadocian texts (cf. Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 13, 18, 34), but by the time of the Hittite power it is limited to royal names with this one exception. If it were not for the usual syntax of such phrases in Old Hittite texts, we would be tempted to translate l. 10 as ". . . Hattusilis [sent?] the chief of the wine," etc.

⁵⁹ Found also in *KBo* IV 13 i 42 in conjunction with Lalantas, Sanauittas (=Sanahuitas?), Ulma, Hassuwas, and Hallaras.

⁶⁰ I. J. Gelb in "Studies in the Topography of Western Asia," *AJSL*, LV (1938), 75 f., believes this statement is an argument in his favor for locating Hahhas in North Syria; however Landsberger, in *Belleten*, III, 223, doubts if this mention can help establish the site. If the sea mentioned here is the Mediterranean, we may look for Hahhas either on the sea or not far from it.

⁶¹ 2 *BoTU* 30 iv 1 f.

⁶² *Ibid.* 23 A i 21-23; 8 ii 50-51, 61-67.

⁶³ *HAB*, p. 33, commenting on 2 *BoTU* 8 i 4||ii 4 says this prince was the nephew of Hattusilis I and not his own son; but this interpretation stretches the phraseology of the text—especially in view of the mutilation of the lines at this point. Moreover, it implies the king had no sons of his own; but we know from this text that he did, and in *ibid.* 12A, if it is properly assigned, others are named.

been given the title of the *labarnas*-son⁶⁴ started the insurrection. The hopes of the king had been placed on this boy, and his training had been begun, but to no avail. "Tears he did not pour out, compassion he did not have, and he was cold and not merciful." The king, hearing of the plot, disowned his son and banished him forever from Hattusas but provided a house, fields, and flocks for his maintenance.⁶⁵

Other revolts took place within the kingdom, but whether in conjunction with that of the *labarnas*-son or at a different time it is difficult to say; probably the former is the case. Huzziyas, who may have been a son of Hattusilis,⁶⁶ was sent to the city Tappassandas, whose people received him and began to wean him away from loyalty to the king, saying, "Revolt against thy father's head." Simultaneously, some of the princes of Hatti became disaffected; they went to a person known as the "daughter" (very probably Hattusilis' daughter) and poisoned her mind against the king, exhorting her, "[Against the head] of thy father [rebel].⁶⁷ [A serva]nt he will set up. . . ." The revolt threw the land into turmoil and found adherents in the palace itself, but the rebels were overcome and captured. Again the king showed his leniency by merely banishing the woman. Taken first to Hattusas, she was later sent to Kussaras, where she was given fields and herds for her support, and whence she was forbidden to return to the capital lest she bring harm to the king's house. Before the assembled nobles the king disavowed her: "[Now you shall no]t do [evil to me]; that one (i.e., the daughter) did evil, [but] I will not do [evil]; that one [did not call] me father, I shall not call her daughter." Sometime afterward, the king fell ill in the royal residence of Kussaras and, fearful of the succession, promulgated before the nobles a decree designating his successor—a document valuable for its theories of state-

⁶⁴ A study of *labarnas* or *tabarnas* shows that it is only a title; hence in this text it cannot be taken as the name of any king as is done in *HAB*, pp. 21 f. If it were not for the mention of Mursilis in ii 37 and in the colophon, we would have difficulties properly assigning this text to the right king, as no other royal name occurs. The author hopes to publish soon a more extensive discussion of the use of *labarnas* or *tabarnas*, and of its significance for the concept of kingship.

⁶⁵ Cf. *HAB*, p. 62.

⁶⁶ We cannot conclude that Huzziyas was in line for the throne and forfeited his claims by the affair at Tappassandas (cf. *HAB*, p. 113), but the reference to "thy father's head" may very well indicate that Huzziyas was the son of Hattusilis, as pointed out by Sommer and Falkenstein.

⁶⁷ Cf. *HAB*, p. 10, ll. 70–71 for a different restoration.

craft.⁶⁸ In a sense it may be considered the last will and testament of the old king, for, in order to avoid disunity and dissension, he bequeathed his authority to Mursilis as his son and heir. Apparently this boy was a minor son of the king by a mother different from her whose children had revolted.⁶⁹ The assembly of nobles (the *pankus*) and the chief dignitaries of the kingdom were convoked to gain their loyalty to the boy whom the king had appointed and to bind them to the throne. This meeting of the *pankus*, the first we know about in the Old Kingdom, is valuable for determining the power of the king. He was sufficiently independent of the assembly to name a successor from his own family, but he feared the centrifugal forces of the kingdom would bring about its disruption if the nobles were not bound by oath to the unifying control of the throne. In Hattusilis' opinion, only the adherence of the *pankus* to the throne would guarantee the continuity of the dynasty and the kingdom.⁷⁰ As the history of the Old Kingdom is recounted it will be evident that the forces which the king feared did ultimately weaken the realm and destroy reverence and awe for the royal personage.

Apprehensive of what might happen after his death, the king reviewed to his nobles the difficulties of his own reign. Fearful lest they recall the *labarnas*-son, he admonished them to obey his wishes and, in order that the land might prosper, to be united and loyal to the young prince Mursilis. Hattusilis, further, foresaw that if the *labarnas*-son were in power he would avenge himself on the people who had sided with the king during the rebellion, and he pointed out the danger to

⁶⁸ This decree, No. 8 in 2 *BoTU*, is preserved partly in Akkadian and partly in Hittite, but only in a few places can a composite text be made. Since in the middle no Akkadian is preserved, and the Hittite sections are often broken, we are forced to restore the missing parts, a procedure which is extremely hypothetical at best. The most recent and best discussion of the text is that in *HAB*; although we have accepted many of their observations, other conclusions and especially some restorations have been rejected as insecure. In several places our interpretation does not follow theirs and was worked out before *HAB* appeared. For a summary of their conclusions see pp. 201 f. Also for the revolt cf. Götze, *AO*, XXVII, Heft 2, 17.

⁶⁹ There is no reason for maintaining that the boy was the grandson of Hattusilis and the son either of Huzziyas or of the "daughter," as has been done (cf. *HAB*, pp. 67 [n. 2], 71, and 209). The king explicitly speaks of "my son, Mursilis." This checks with all other contemporary sources in which the two are mentioned. The fact that the Talmi-šarruma Treaty calls him "grandson" may be the result of a mistake from the late date at which the treaty was compiled; at any rate, contemporary remarks should weigh heavier than later ones. So also Götze, *MAOG*, IV, 64.

⁷⁰ It must be remembered we do not yet have Telepinus' rule for succession, although some of its tenets can be observed in the process of formation.

them: "His mother (is) a serpent; now it shall happen (that) the word of his mother, of his brothers and of his sisters [he] will continually hear, and he will approach to return vengeance. The warriors, dignitaries [and] servants who are appoi[n]ted by the king, [he will sw]ear (of them): 'Now these shall continually die before the king.' . . . And it shall happen (that) whoever are sons of Hatti, he will approach thus, and to whom there is an ox or a sheep he will approach to lead (it) away. . . . Now let it not happen, afterwards he will establish [my land in ru]in."

For his formal education and military instruction, Mursilis was placed in the hands of the nobles, to whom the king said: "Behold my son Mursilis, now [protect h]im and set him up (on the throne); to that one [the great heart of the gods] is given [. . .] in the place of the lion [. . . to] a lion. [If] at [any] time the word of battle passes (i.e., comes), or any [wor]ld of [rebellion becomes hea]vy (then), my servants and (my) great men, be [helpers to my son. After] three years then let him go on a campaign, [and] thus [a kin]g, [a hero] I shall [mak]e him. If thus not yet . . . him. The seed of your Sun⁷¹ (is) he, now [m]ake him great, a [king], a he[ro]. If on a campaign you take [him, then] bring [him] back [safe]. Also let your family(?) be one as the wolf's. Let it never be [hostile?], its servants are borne [of one mother?]."

Next the king gave advice to the nobles for their own actions: "[Moreover] you shall not be overweening, let not anyone [be hos]tile, and let not anyone violate the word. This [affair] of the city Sinahuwas, and the city Ubaryas you shall not do; let evil not be established. And now my son shall do my [work?]. [Let not anyo]ne say, thus the king [does (according to)] the evil of his heart, [an]d I acquit it i.e., wink at it) whether it is or whether it is not (true). [Now] let not [that] evil be established. [You, more]over, [who kno]w my work and my wisdom, now indoctrinate my son." "Let not the elders speak a word, [. . .] he is called; now let not the elders of Hatti speak to thee. [Let not the man of . . .], let not the man of Hemmuwas, let not the man of Tamalkiyas, let not the [man of . . .], let not the country population, let not anyone speak." The rulers of the cities mentioned presumably sided with the rebels, and just as the king cautioned his

⁷¹ The first Old Kingdom reference so far found to the royal title common during the Empire.

nobles against imitating the rebellious acts of Sinahuwas and Ubariyas, so is he warning them to avoid the deeds of the men specified. The king contrasts their unfaithful actions with what he hoped Mursilis would do: "Now [formerly?] no one took my desire. [Now thou (art)] m[y son], Mursilis, now take and keep [the wo]rd [of the father]; if the word of the father thou dost keep, [then bread], thou sha[lt ea]t, and water thou shalt drink. When adulthood [(is) in thy heart], then eat two or three times a day and care for thyself; [when however] old age (is) in thy heart, then drink (to thy heart's content), and the words [of the father] throw away." In a similar vein he talked to the nobles: "[Now] among my [fir]st servants (are) you; now my word, (that) of the king, keep; then bread you shall eat, and water you shall drink; [then Hattu]sas shall be raised up, and my country [(shall be) ca]lm(?). If, however, the word of the king you do not keep, in future you shall not live, and you will be destroyed. [Besides, whoever] makes ineffectual the words of the king, then let him [not be min]ister(?), that one (is) my first servant. Let not anyone pierce the member."⁷² "[Now] keep my word, that of the *labarnas*, the king. [If] you keep it, then Hattusas will stand and you will make your land [ca]lm; (then) bread you will eat and water you will drink. If, however, you do [not] keep (it), your country will become that of another. Now be mindful of the affairs of the gods; and their bread (portions), (and) their wine (portions), and their bread crumbs, (and) their meal is to be set up. And also thou shalt neither turn nor slacken. If thou turnest, then (will) former evil (be). So be it!"⁷³

The king concludes with admonitions to Mursilis⁷⁴ and to a woman called Hastayaras, who was mentioned earlier.⁷⁵ To Mursilis he said:

⁷² Compare this idea with 2 *BoTU* 10β:8–12, and 20–21. The punishment seems to be the same.

⁷³ The change in iii 51–54 to the second person singular from the plural of iii 46–50 is peculiar. Whenever the king addressed Mursilis, the singular was used; when he spoke to the assembled people, the plural; but the change does not seem to mean that Hattusilis began here his final speech to his son, for that begins in the next paragraph.

⁷⁴ Cf. the "Instructions to Merikere" and the "Instructions of Amenemhet."

⁷⁵ The fact that Hattusilis counsels her seems to mean she is a person of importance—an idea borne out by the mention of her in the anecdote cited above. She may have been the mother of Mursilis, or, better, his wife (*HAB*, p. 189 n. 1 and p. 209, consider her the legitimate wife of Hattusilis, i.e., the *tawannannas*, and therefore not the *tawannannas* mentioned in 2 *BoTU* 10β:6 whom they presume to be the mother of Hattusilis). She might with some reason be thought the mother of one of the disinherited and rebellious sons; but, had she been the daughter or wife of any of these, she would have been disgraced with

"Thus I have given thee my word, now this [tab]let let them read aloud before thee month by month. Thus thou wilt impress my [wo]rds and my document in the heart, and my servants and great ones thou wilt govern well. The evil from anyone, thou wilt see; whether anyone sins before the god, or anyone speaks any word (of evil), then ask again the assembly (*pankus*), thus then let the tongue (i.e., decision?) be turned back to the assembly. My son, what is in [thy] heart, do it." He warned Hastayaras not to oppose him or to let it be said either by the king or by the princes that she was going to the Old Women⁷⁶ for oracles. If she stayed away from them, the king declared, he would not have to protect her by claiming ignorance of her affairs when an accusation was brought. Concluding his caution, he again warned her not to oppose him, and if she needed information to come and he would impart his affairs to her himself.⁷⁷

The revolt of the sons of Hattusilis seems to have impressed itself strongly on the mind of the king, for about the same time⁷⁸ he left a second entreaty to the nobles of the kingdom to support his successor. The beginning of the document containing this plea is now broken, but it is an injunction against anyone mentioning the names of the sons and daughters of a woman called the *tawannannas*, under penalty of being hanged in the gate. This woman seems to have been the wife of Hattusilis (perhaps the mother of the *labarnas*-son); the sons and daughters to have been concerned in the disaffection of the *labarnas*-son.⁷⁹

The king instructed his subjects: "Behold, I gave Mursilis to you for them (i.e., for the sons and daughters); let him take the throne of his father, and my son (i.e., the *labarnas*-son) (is) not a son;⁸⁰ and my servants, let your family be one as (that) of the wolf. And also, whoever makes ineffectual(?) the word of the king—whether the *Mešidi*-

them and not addressed here. Her connection in some way with divination may relate her to the cult; hence, instead of being a member of the royal family, she may have been an oracle priestess—a supposition not rendered impossible by any other reference.

⁷⁶ Women concerned with magic or oracle-giving (cf. Götze, *The Ritual of Tunnawi*, p. 30, and *HAB*, pp. 193 f.).

⁷⁷ This entire account in 2 *BoTU* 8.

⁷⁸ Cf. also *HAB*, p. 212.

⁷⁹ Some have taken the woman to be the mother of Hattusilis (cf. previous reference), and others to be Hastayaras (so Götze, *Kleinasien*, p. 87).

⁸⁰ Cf. 2 *BoTU* 8 i 14, where Hattusilis disavows his rebellious son by saying, "He is not my son."

men, the bastard men, or the *musa*-men make (it) ineffectual(?)—these cur[ses], the sons of the palace (i.e., the princes) . . . ; whi[ch-ever] son of the palace his [wo]rds shall make ineffectual(?), h[is] neck(?) let them not] pierce, and let them hang him in his gate. If [you es]tablish [my] word, then also my country you shall [make calm, then] a fire on the hearth you shall kindle; [if] my word you violate, then a fire on the hearth you shall not kindle and it shall come (to pass, that) the serpent shall encoil Hattusas.” To bring home his warning more forcefully, Hattusilis pointed to the fate of two cities which had been chastened for a rebellious act, and a third which was about to be punished: “The man of the city of Zalpas threw away the word of the father; here (is) that city of Zalpas. The man of the city of Hassuwas threw away the word of the father; this (is) that city of Hassuwas. Well, the man of the very city Halpas also threw away the word of the father, and the city Halpas will be destroyed.” This is the sole reference to a punishment of Hassuwas; hence its attendant circumstances are unknown unless the affair of Sandas is meant.⁸¹

After succeeding his father on the throne about 1775 B.C., Mursilis expanded the power of the Old Hittite Kingdom⁸² to its farthest extent, although he apparently did not try to maintain permanent control of all the territory invaded. Apparently a minor at the time of his accession, he was intrusted to the *pankus* for his formal education, as we have seen, for the command given it to take Mursilis on a campaign after three years implies that he would attain his majority then and was to be introduced to military affairs. We may, therefore, suggest that he was about thirteen or fourteen years old at his father's death.

Many cities figure in the events of this period, but we learn little of the part they played. Arzawas still belonged to the kingdom; Ankuwas, Sanahuittas, Hurmas, and Ullammas, chief cities of Hattusilis' time, were still important. In addition, we have some new ones: Taru- . . . , Hakmissas, Hattenas, Hatras, Miniyas, Paramanzanas. Sah- . . . , Harsanhilas, Tassan- . . . , Arimatta- . . . , Parukit-

⁸¹ 2 *BoTU* 10β:13–31; for Sandas see above, p. 191.

⁸² We employ the term “Old Hittite Kingdom” instead of the usual designation “Old Hittite Empire” because we believe that the latter expression implies too extensive a territory and that the expansion of the dynasty was not impelled by imperial motives. The term “Empire” would be more exact when applied to Hittite expansion at the time of Suppiluliumas or after.

tas, Zunnaharas, and Sinuwantas.⁸³ Other cities important for the reign will be mentioned with the events which concern them.

In Mursilis' reign the Habiru appear for the first time among the Hittites, who hired them as mercenaries. A series of accidents involving the army personnel compelled the Hittites to hire such troops. First, an unknown individual died in Sugziyas; next, Karawanis, Parayunis, and . . .-ayuktaerayas, the chiefs of the army, died; consequently, the Hittite king gathered together three thousand Habiru warriors and put them as a garrison in a city whose name is lost. The employment of these warriors by Mursilis extends the theater of our knowledge of their operation to Asia Minor and shows their social status among the Hittites.⁸⁴

The beginning of the reign at least was propitious; the land was united, and the various people of the king's family and court were loyal—or so we are told by the stock formula used to describe the first three kings' reigns.⁸⁵ Trouble did exist within the country and on the frontiers, however, and the king was occupied in the field suppressing rebellious cities and protecting his outlying provinces. The Hurri people made an incursion but the kingdom was able to resist them, and the king boasted that the gods brought about their death. Following this repulsion, Nippas, the leader of the army, died.⁸⁶ Burushandas was rebellious, but the people fell into the king's hand, and the city was destroyed.⁸⁷ Zalpaz, which had not yet been sufficiently subjugated, again revolted. Happis, the leader and organizer of the insurrection,

⁸³ All from 2 *BoTU* 17A, Ba, Bβ, or 10γ.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 17A iii 35–41; 17Ba:6–11; 17Bβ:9. A. Jirku, "Die Wanderungen der Hebräer," *AO*, XXIV, Heft 2 (1924), 17, and n. 3, calls attention to this text but makes no attempt to place it chronologically except roughly in the second millennium. For some reason scholars generally have lost sight of the reference. Professor Walther was inclined to see the Habiru also in the *hippara-men* (Akk. *astru*, Sum. *nam-ra*)—especially if the Habiru were settled foreigners in a kind of dependence on the king—and thus to consider them comparable to the Old Babylonian *muškēnûtu*.

⁸⁵ 2 *BoTU* 23A i 24 f.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 17A iii 32–4; 17Ba:3–5. Possibly this event is to be connected with Mursilis' despoiling of the Hurri lands at the time he took Babylon, but the broken source does not give sufficient material for one to judge conclusively.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 10γ:5–6; 17A iii 9. These two texts have been placed in the reign of Mursilis because of internal evidence. The apparent reference in No. 10γ to the revolt against Hattusilis I fits the insurrection of the princes; and the story of trouble with Burushandas in this text fits with the destruction of the city given in 17A. Further evidence for the assignment of the latter text to the time of Mursilis is the phrase "the father of the king" in ii 2 which, as we have seen, is common in documents of Mursilis which refer to his father (cf. 12A).

and seemingly a son of the king, announced to the people of the city that he was unfriendly to his father and could return to Hattusas only under penalty of death. The king, hearing of the unfriendly words spoken in Zalpas, marched to the city Harahsus, where he defeated the troops of Zalpas, but Happis escaped. A certain Damnassus, who took part in the action, was captured and conducted to Hattusas. Following three years of inactivity, the king went to Zalpas where he remained three more years, apparently besieging the city. During this time he demanded that the city surrender Happis; when it refused, he renewed activities with more vigor, and many were killed. It was now time for the king to go to Hattusas to worship the gods, but he left the great men behind. Back at Zalpas once more, he made the futile gesture of reminding its inhabitants: "I (am) your king(?)." Finally, the warriors who were with the Great King took the city.⁸⁸

Remembering the disturbances during his father's reign, Mursilis issued an edict to prevent offenses against the person of the king. The rules therein may be considered in the same vein as those of Hattusilis and as antecedents of the regulations later promulgated by Telepinus. How well Mursilis accomplished his purpose will be seen when the close of the reign is discussed.

"And now if a son does harm to the king, anyone shall call him in(?), then let him go (up); if he is acquitted, then thine eye [he shall] see. If the river-god refuses *ša-zu*, in his (own) house let him dwell. [Thou shalt] attend to (him), and thou shalt care for [him], now care for him! If, however, thou dost not care for (him), then (at least) let him be in his (own) house. Thou shalt not put (him) in prison; moreover thou shalt not do him evil, thou shalt not prepare his death, [thou shalt not] sell [him]. Thou shalt not harm the gods in heaven, more over on earth thou shalt (not) harm **menuwes*.

"They were very guilty toward the head of my father and the river-god; and the father of the king did not cause them to live. Kizzuwas⁸⁹ was guilty against the head of my father and the river-god; and my father did not cause him, Kizzuwas, to live.

⁸⁸ 2 *BoTU* 13 ii 20-32. For ll. 29-30 an alternate explanation may be given: that it was a pestilence which had started in the land of Hatti; after it had killed many people, the king, leaving behind the chief men, returned to Hattusas to consult the gods in order to discover the cause of the plague.

⁸⁹ Cf. Kizzuis, chief of the *Mešidi* (*ibid.* 12A ii 32). Are the two the same?

"And now, I, the king, have seen great evil, and my word, (that) of the king, you shall not break. This queen of the city Hurmas was a bride, my [father] had done good to her.

"And where do you bring the queen, (and) the princess . . . whichever king I set on my throne. . . ." ⁹⁰

What the trouble was with the queen of Hurmas we do not learn, for the decree is not preserved beyond this point. It may be suggested that it was because of disturbances begun by the queen that Mursilis felt impelled to issue this warning. Interesting is the use of the river for trial by ordeal, and, as before, we wonder at the mildness of the punishment meted out to the guilty party. He is not to be put to death but is to be allowed to live in his own house free from the fear of enslavement and merely under observation. ⁹¹

The most significant events of Mursilis' reign are not his wars in the Hittite country but the expeditions undertaken in North Syria and Mesopotamia partly to experience new conquests and partly to reaffirm Hittite control over the rebellious vassal in Aleppo. Although Hattusilis had threatened to punish the uprising, no one, possibly because of the regency, had yet tried to re-establish Hittite authority. Thus about 1750 B.C. ⁹² Mursilis left his homeland and ventured into Syria. En route he captured a number of the messengers of the king of Aleppo but allowed them to return to the city. In the city of Tinisipas certain parties captured the mother of a certain Zuppas and killed her, and, though it is hard to believe, they ate her. Zuppas himself shortly before had escaped a similar fate. ⁹³ After the storm-god of Aleppo had

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 10γ:9-23.

⁹¹ It is not new to find unusual leniency among the Hittites, for some of the provisions of the law code are surprisingly mild. The sentence here pronounced on the guilty parties is similar to the one we found Hattusilis pronouncing against the rebels in his family. The mildness of Hittite codes is further illustrated by the actions of Hattusilis III, who, on usurping the throne, banished Urhi-Tesupas, the deposed monarch, instead of putting him to death (cf. A. Götze, *MVAG*, XXIX, Heft 3, 34, col. iv 31 f.). Cf. also the decree of Telepinus and its relationship to affairs here, below, pp. 209 f.

⁹² A. T. Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria*, p. 117. Some revision of the date for this expedition may be necessary, for we must allow some time between the capture of Aleppo and the sack of Babylon in 1750 B.C.

⁹³ Forrer in *2 BoTU* 11* associates this Zuppas with an individual of the same name found in *KB* I 11 (translation: D. D. Luckenbill, *AJSL*, XXXVII, 207 f., and H. G. Güterbock, *ZA*, XLIV, 114 f.), an Akkadian text from Boğazköy which he connects with the Aleppo incident. F. Sommer, *AU*, p. 43, and Güterbock, *ZA*, XLIV, 113, accept this view. Besides Zuppas, there are three other names in the text—Sandas, Nunnus, and Kule[t]—which are found in Old Kingdom sources (cf. 12A), but several items are questionable. The Akkadian text names a certain Tutḫaliyas who may or may not be a Hittite

fled,⁹⁴ the Hittites soon entered the city and destroyed it, placing its citizens in captivity and sending back their goods as booty to Hattusas.⁹⁵

Following the capture of Aleppo, Mursilis pushed on, apparently to the east of the Euphrates, and plundered the countryside. Probably as the result of one of these incursions, the people of Šuda and of Zu- . . . came to help the city Uqabbuwas. Kanius, a man of Šuda, and Uqabbuwas went to meet someone whose name is now lost from the text. DUMU.MAH.LIL-is⁹⁶ arrived at the city and brought in his warriors. Kanius placed swine's flesh before him to determine by divination whether they would fight. He took the pig's flesh, ate it, and gave some of it to others to eat along with something to drink. The result of this divination is not known.⁹⁷ Perhaps as one of the raids which were then being made, a group which seems to have been the Hittites left Nuhayanas⁹⁸ and rode to the city Ilanzuras;⁹⁹ there they took its cattle and sheep, killed its people, and ravaged the land. Its king, seeing that his land was being laid waste, implored help from the kings of the Hurri warriors, Uwantis, Urutittis, Arwi- . . . , and Uwagazza-

king, and also the names of three generations of kings; hence, if we accept Forrer's view, the grandfather would have to be Labarnas. But we have no information that indicates Labarnas ever left Asia Minor or that Aleppo was taken before Hattusilis I, who seems to have been the first Hittite to do so. In the Empire we have a number of possibilities. Although the text gives many details, no essential change has to be made in the history of this time if it is not included. Until we can be more certain, it seems best to omit the document.

On p. 10* Forrer indicates that Aleppo had already fallen to the Hittites when Zuppas' mother was taken, but our evidence does not warrant such a view.

⁹⁴ 2 *BoTU* 14a i 8.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 23A i 28-29; 20 ii 10-14; 21 iii 2-8.

⁹⁶ Cf. Güterbock, *ZA*, XLIV, 111, n. 1, for comment on this name.

⁹⁷ 2 *BoTU* 21 ij 6-21. Šuda is frequently associated with Waššukani, the capital of Mitanni, and is located by some writers in the neighborhood of Nisibis (Mayer and Garstang, *Index of Hittite Names*, p. 43). Dr. Gelb informs me that he would locate it near the Tigris northeast of Nisibis. It is also known from a Mari document (cf. Dossin, *Syria*, XIX, 116).

⁹⁸ W. F. Albright, *BASOR*, No. 78 (April, 1940), p. 30 says: "Nukhayana may plausibly be identified with the district of Nikhani in Subartu. . . ."

⁹⁹ The only other mention of this city so far found is in the Mari documents, which name a king, Halisuma, and a commander Dūrni-el (cf. Dossin, *Syria*, XIX, 115, 125; *ibid.*, XX, 109). Albright (*BASOR*, No. 78, pp. 29 [n. 43] and 30) calls attention to the Akkadian spelling Ilanšura (the Hittite orthography has been presented in this paper) and places the city between Carchemish and Harran not too close to the Euphrates.

nis¹⁰⁰ and sent them golden vessels.¹⁰¹ Whether the help came or not is unknown.

Apparently at this time, Mursilis made his well-known campaign against Babylon.¹⁰² Taking advantage of the disorder and weakness of the age, he descended upon Babylon in the time of Samsu-ditana, the last king of the First Dynasty, and brought it to an end about 1750 B.C.¹⁰³ Babylon was given up to plunder, and its inhabitants were enslaved; then, laden with booty and captives, the Hittites retired to Hattusas. At a later date, someone in a penitential mood put a curse on Mursilis and acknowledged: "We did harm to the gods in heaven . . . the property of Babylon we took . . . ; [we] sought for oxen and sheep; . . . he killed, and its blood, [its] flesh(?). . . ." ¹⁰⁴

The expedition brought no permanent results to the Hittites and merely completed the disintegration of the First Dynasty, thus opening the way for the Kassite Dynasty to establish itself in 1749 B.C. For many years to come the Hittites had too much trouble maintaining themselves against invaders—some of whom, as we shall see, may be considered Hurri people—or were too disorganized by internal and dynastic conflict to follow up this expedition. Before Hittite power went into eclipse, and apparently as part of the raid on Babylon, Mursilis was able to ravage the lands of the Hurri people (who seem to have been under several rulers) and to carry booty and captives back to Hattusas.¹⁰⁵

The dynastic difficulties which had started under Hattusilis I again flared up. The edicts promulgated to protect the person of the king

¹⁰⁰ P. E. Dumont (in Albright, *BASOR*, No. 78, p. 30) believes these names Indo-Iranian. This would mean that the forerunners of the Mitannian nobles were already in Upper Mesopotamia—a startling view which, if substantiated, will be extremely important.

¹⁰¹ 2 *BoTU* 21 iii 9–15.

¹⁰² Telepinus describes this incident as though it were a continuation of the Aleppo expedition, and then proceeds to Mursilis' defeat of the Hurri. Another text interposes the Hurri episode between the conquest of Aleppo and the sack of Babylon (cf. 2 *BoTU* 20 ii 10 f.).

¹⁰³ L. W. King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, II, 22. The date used here comes from studies of A. T. Olmstead and is based upon the date 2049 B.C. as the beginning of the First Dynasty. We have not employed the proposed new chronology, but if it is used, a general revision downward must be made; cf. also Appen. C.

¹⁰⁴ 2 *BoTU* 16:4–7.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 20 ii 15–20; 23A i 29–31; for mention of the Hurri kings cf. *ibid.* 21 iii 13.

were of no avail, for Hantilis, a cupbearer married to Harapsilis, sister of Mursilis, conspired with Zidantas; "and they did an evil thing, and they killed Mursilis, and they shed blood."¹⁰⁶ Thus with the help of Zidantas, Hantilis seized the throne. Once in power, however, he became afraid, for things seem to have gone badly in the kingdom. After starting on a military expedition to bring the land back to subjection, he stated to his troops: "Now this I did, and Zidantas . . . I heard. . . ." Seemingly, we have here all that is left of Hantilis' justification for the murder of his predecessor. As part of this campaign, he dispatched warriors to an unknown destination, probably southward toward the territory of the cities Hurpanas,¹⁰⁷ Astatas, . . .-yas, and Carchemish; whether these cities had revolted from Hittite domination or whether they had been attacked by hostile forces is not clear. The mention of Astatas (on the Euphrates in the region of Carchemish)¹⁰⁸ and Carchemish, as well as the fact that Hantilis went to the city of Tegarama, possibly as part of this troop movement, indicates that the Hittites still claimed control of North Syria and the avenue of approach to it.

Worse events now occurred. The Hurri people appear to have invaded the Hittite kingdom and to have reached a point well within the borders of the country before they were turned back. The queen of Sugziyas, who had in some way harmed the Hittite monarch, was brought to account for her misdeeds and, together with her sons, killed. Action next shifted to Tegarama, but what happened is unknown.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 23A i 31-34.

¹⁰⁷ A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* (1923), p. 37, equates this city with the classical Arabissos. This is of particular importance and places the two cities with which Hantilis was concerned in the same area. Tegarama is in the eastern mountains and is usually considered the Assyrian Til Garimmu and the biblical Togormah.

¹⁰⁸ E. Forrer, "Gargamiš und Astatas," *Forschungen*, II, Heft 1 (1926), 41 f.; Mayer and Garstang, *Index of Hittite Names*, p. 8.

¹⁰⁹ Suppiluliumas held a review of his troops near this city before descending against Carchemish and Syria (2 *BoTU* 41 ii 27-29; *KBo* V 6 ii 27-29). Is it possible Hantilis did the same? If so, it adds proof to the view that some kind of military action was afoot to preserve the kingdom. Götze, *AO*, XXVII, 19, believes the Kaskas were involved in this, but we cannot be certain, for these people, on whom the writer now has a monograph in preparation, are first referred to in texts of the Empire.

It is unfortunate that our information on Hantilis' reign comes from fragmentary paragraphs of Telopinus' proclamation, which, although preserved in this place in Hittite and Akkadian, have not been successfully worked together. Since the text of 2 *BoTU* 23A must be restored for these sections from duplicates, it is best to quote by paragraphs; thus we cite §§ 12-17; cf. also *KUB* III 89; *KBo* I 27.

Further military weakness is exhibited by the subsequent course of events. Although none of his predecessors had done so, Hantilis erected forts throughout the Hittite land and strengthened the ramparts of his capital, Hattusas.¹¹⁰ That his danger was real is shown by the destruction of Nerikkas and Tiliuras, which were not rebuilt until the times of Mursilis II and Hattusilis III.¹¹¹ Perhaps it was in the region around the latter city that Hantilis was forced to come to terms with marauders whom Labarnas and Hattusilis I had been strong enough to keep on the far side of the Kumesmahas River. Hantilis, confronted by them in his territory, acknowledged the accomplished fact and his inability to cope with it by making settlements for them.¹¹²

This, however, is not the only evidence for disruption of the Old Kingdom. We discover that Hantilis, in contradistinction to the people of the city Kalasmas, neglected to perform certain purification rites and consequently brought uncleanness into the city and the palace.¹¹³ Since our information comes from a "historical-ritualistic" text, it would seem to indicate that the priesthood was scandalized enough by the actions of Hantilis to mention his misdemeanors in their records. Thus the religious personnel apparently had to find an explanation for some misfortune and lit upon Hantilis' lack of vigor in performing his religious obligations.

Although the Hittite kingdom had indeed experienced bad times during the reign of Hantilis, more evil was to befall it after his death.¹¹⁴ His son, Pisenis, and all his grandsons were killed by Zidantas, who then ascended the throne; but he, too, fell before an assassin: "The gods avenged the blood of Pisenis, and the gods made his son, Ammunas, his enemy; and he killed Zidantas, his father."¹¹⁵ The length of

¹¹⁰ 2 *BoTU* 20 iii 12-18. The statement that Hantilis built Hattusas (*ibid.* II, 16-18) does not mean that he resurrected the city from destruction or that it was first built and fortified by him (contrary view, Götze, *AO*, XXVII, 19). Instead, it is a simple statement that Hantilis erected buildings or fortifications which he found essential for the protection of the capital.

¹¹¹ A. Götze, "Neue Bruchstücke zum Grossen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexten," *MVAG*, XXXIV, Heft 2 (1930), 24; *ibid.*, XXIX, Heft 3 (1924), 26; E. H. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (1935), p. 76; *KUB* XXV 21 iii 1 f. and XXI 29 i 11 f.

¹¹² *KUB* XXI 29 ii 3 f.

¹¹³ 2 *BoTU* 22A.

¹¹⁴ From the Hittite text (*ibid.* 23A § 18) one might suppose that Hantilis was alive at the time Zidantas organized his plot, but the Akkadian duplicate (*KBo* I 27:11) clearly indicates that he had died previously.

¹¹⁵ 2 *BoTU* 23A §§ 18-19.

time concerned in these events is uncertain. Whereas Hantilis seems to have had the longer reign and to have become old in office, Zidantas would appear to have been on the throne only a short time when he was killed.

Misfortune for the royal family and for the state continued; more trouble beset Ammunas than had come to his predecessors; the kingdom shrank until its borders roughly corresponded to those of Labarnas, or possibly even of Anittas. When the seasons were unfriendly and fought against Ammunas, famine came to the land, for "The grain, the [orchards], the vineyards, the cattle, and the sheep [did] not [prosper] in his hand." Countries and cities which had remained loyal in the time of Hantilis now revolted, namely, the cities . . . -las, Galmiyas, Sallapas, Parduwas, and Ahhulas, and the lands of Adaniyas¹¹⁶ and Arzawas. When Ammunas went forth with his army to bring the rebellious lands back to his control, he was unsuccessful.¹¹⁷

When Ammunas died, conspiracy in the royal family and among the nobles began anew. Zurus, chief of the *Mešidi*, sent his son, Taharwailis, a man of the golden emblem,¹¹⁸ to kill the family and sons of Tittis, perhaps members of the family of Ammunas; then Taruhsus, a runner, was sent to kill Hantilis¹¹⁹ and his sons. Back of these moves we see a plot to dispose of claimants to the throne who might thwart Zurus and his group from setting up their candidate for the crown. The way was thus cleared for Huzziyas to become king, but he had a brother-in-law, Telepinus,¹²⁰ whom he feared as a rival; hence, once on the throne, he planned to kill his relative. Telepinus learned of the plot, drove off the would-be murderers, and ascended the throne himself.¹²¹ He then felt obliged to remove Huzziyas' five brothers. Ac-

¹¹⁶ This must certainly be modern Adana (cf. Olmstead, *JE A*, VIII, 230, n. 4 Hrozný, *ArO*, VII, 162, n. 5; Götze, *AO*, XXVII, 19, n. 1, and *AJA*, XL, 213 f.). *KUB XX 52 i* 17-21 mentions it with ^{URU}Tarsa.

¹¹⁷ 2 *BoTU 23A i* 69-ii 4.

¹¹⁸ The functions of these two men is not known, although it appears that the *Mešidi* were connected with the military or were a sort of police.

¹¹⁹ Not to be confused with the former king, although he probably was related to the royal family.

¹²⁰ Telepinus says he ascended the throne of his fathers. This may be only a figurative way of speaking; more probably it means that Telepinus and Huzziyas were of the royal family. For a seal of Huzziyas the "great king" see Appen. C.

¹²¹ 2 *BoTU 23A §§ 21-22* (§§ 21-22 = col. ii 1-12).

cording to the usual Hittite practice, they were banished to the houses which Huzziyas had given them, and it was decreed: "Let them go, let them dwell (in them); let them eat, and let them drink, and do not do them any harm."¹²² Telepinus thus boasted of his leniency: "Now I declare they did harm to me, but I [did not] harm them."¹²³

Once more a strong and able king was on the throne, bloodshed stopped, and the kingdom began to expand. Telepinus tried to regain the former borders of the kingdom and entered a region neighboring the territory later to be known as the Kaskas land, where were the cities Tapapanuwas, and Hatinzuwas, the city of the god Zithariyas. This was the last time any Hittite king invaded these regions until Mursilis II, a couple of centuries later.¹²⁴ In the same manner that he pushed back the northern or eastern frontier, he forced back his southern border and compelled Ispudahsus, king of Kizwatnas, to make a treaty with him.¹²⁵ In another military maneuver he attacked and destroyed the city Hassuwas. His warriors stationed in the city Zizzilibbis fought a battle there which reputedly was a victory, but may not have been, for he failed to record its outcome. Following that he went to the city Lawazzantiyas¹²⁶ which a certain Lahhas had incited to rebellion and compelled it to reacknowledge him as king. In these campaigns the chief officers were the commander of a thousand men; U- . . . , the commander of . . . ; Karruwas, the commander of the overseers of the treasury; Inaras, commander of the cupbearers;

¹²² Again we must point out the similarity between the treatment given these men and that which Hattusilis I gave to the *labarnas*-son and "the daughter"; also, one should note the corresponding treatment which Hattusilis I's edict (published as 2 *BoTU* 10β) specified would-be offenders were to receive.

¹²³ *Ibid.* 23A ii 13-15.

¹²⁴ Götze, *AM*, p. 164.

¹²⁵ *KUB* XXX 42 iv 15 f. Güterbock, in *MDOG*, LXXIII (1935), 33, translates a part of this tablet which mentions the treaty with Ispudahsus. Now in *KUB* XXXI 81 and 82 are published Akkadian and Hittite fragments of a treaty, but they are too small to be of much service. A. Götze, "Philological Remarks on the Bilingual Bulla from Tarsus," *AJA*, XL (1936), 210 f., equates the Ispudahsu of the Tarsus bulla with Ispudahsus of Kizwatnas. His difficulty over the title "Great King," which is found on the bulla, may be resolved if it was assumed during the period of weakness previous to Telepinus' usurpation of the throne. On the other hand, since we have no mention earlier than Telepinus that Kizwatnas was under Hittite domination, the ruler of that land could as justifiably employ the title as could the Hittite king.

¹²⁶ This city is probably to be located on the route from Syria to Hattusas in the southern mountain region; Hattusilis III passed through it on his return from the Egyptian wars (cf. Götze, "Neue Bruckstücke," *MVAG*, XXXIV, Heft 2 [1930], 12). Telepinus places it in connection with Hassuwas, which then must be in the same general area.

Killas, commander of . . . ; Dattamimmas, commander of the scepter-bearers; Zinwaselis and Lillis, commanders of. . . .¹²⁷

These same men organized a plot against Telepinus apparently to restore Huzziyas and to free his five brothers, for word was sent to Tanuwas, a scepter-bearer, and to the two former conspirators, Taharwailis and Taruhsus. When Telepinus finally heard of the conspiracy, he had the men seized and brought before the assembly (*pankus*) for sentence. Again the king showed his mercy and reasoned with the assembly: "Why should they die? Now they shall hide (their) faces." The king's arguments were successful, for he has recorded: "Then I, the king, banished them, I made (them) farmers, I took weapons from the right side, and I gave yokes(?) to them."¹²⁸

After his wife Istapariyas, and his son Ammunas died, Telepinus, in an attempt to preserve the royal family from future dissension, called together the assembly of chief men (*tuliyas*),¹²⁹ and proclaimed a number of rules. The first begins: "Let no one in Hattusas harm a son of the (royal) family." Then he established a rule for succession to the throne: A son of a wife of first rank was to be the heir; if there were no son, the successor to the dead king would be selected from a son of a wife of second rank; failing such a son, then a man who was specifically chosen to marry a daughter of a wife of first rank was to become the next king.¹³⁰ Telepinus desired that the king thus selected would have his nobles' and family's support and would conduct himself correctly: "In the future, whoever after me becomes king, then may his brothers, his sons, the men of his wife's family, the men of his own family, and his warriors be united; then thou shalt come, (and) by strength thou shalt hold the enemy country subject." Telepinus cautioned future kings not to act contrary to their promises and not to avow pardon of an inimical act when in their hearts they had no such intentions. Further, he forbade a king to kill anyone of the royal family, for it would lead to disaster.

¹²⁷ 2 *BoTU* 23A ii 16-25. For a different arrangement of these officers cf. Sturtevant and Bechtel, *Chrestomathy*, p. 189; Götze suggested the order followed here (cf. Sturtevant and Bechtel, *ibid.*, p. 197).

¹²⁸ 2 *BoTU* 23A ii 25-30.

¹²⁹ See Appen. B.

¹³⁰ The way this worked out in practice can be observed in the Empire. After the death of Muwattallis, who had no son of a wife of first rank, Hattusilis III, his brother, selected Urhi-Tesupas, a son of a wife of second rank (cf. Götze, *MVAG*, XXXIV, Heft 2, 22; Sturtevant and Bechtel, *Chrestomathy*, p. 75).

If a king planned harm to his brothers or sisters, the assembly (*pankus*) must call to his attention the evil that befell Hattusas when bloodshed was common in the royal family. If he persisted in his evil purpose, the assembly (*tuliyas*) was to be called, and capital punishment was to be meted out to the miscreant. In no case was a punishment of death to be pronounced and executed *in secret*, "in the manner of Zuruwas, Tanuwas, Taharwailis, and Taruhsus." Although a ruler who harmed his kin was to be punished, his house, wife, and sons were exempt, and in like manner any prince who sinned was to receive the death penalty; but since it was not right to harm his property, "their houses, their fields, their vineyards, their barns, their male and female slaves, their cattle, and their sheep" were exempt from confiscation. Telepinus strongly condemned as workers of evil those officials—whether they should be fathers of a house, sons of the king, the chief of the *Mešidi*, or the "chief of the wine"—who would plot against a prince to get control of his cities by saying, "Such and such a city should be mine."

Speaking directly to his assembled officials and nobles, he enumerated them—princes, *Mešidi* men, golden squires, cupbearers, table men, cooks, scepter-bearers, *salashiyas*-men, commanders of a thousand—and he said, "Know this word; moreover, may Tanuwas, Taharwailis, and Taruhsus be a sign before you. Hereafter, if anyone does evil, . . . now you (are) an assembly (*pankus*), bring (him) in, punish him." Once more we find the assembly (*pankus*) designated as a judicial body which could pass sentence and execute it.

In all the extant fragments of Telepinus' decree the next few enactments are so badly preserved that it is impossible to tell what they were. Included with them are two incomplete groups of city names designated as the places in which storehouses were located; the first group originally had a hundred or more, the second, thirty-four names. Among them are some which have been met earlier in the Old Kingdom: Sugziyas, Hurmas, Gulpinas, and Parsuhantas; but most are towns hitherto unknown, although one, Samuhas,¹³¹ an important

¹³¹ Armas Salonen, *Die Wasserfahrzeuge in Babylonien* ("Studia orientalia," VIII, No. 4 [1939], 2) mentions the text Bo 6049 + Bo 7036 (now published *KUB XXXI* 79), which tells of ships going by river from Pitayarigas to Samuhas (cf. also Albright, *BASOR*, No. 78, p. 28). This agrees very well with the identification Samosata (Samsat) for

religious center, is of interest. Following these names are sections which seem to deal with the regulation of fields, the conduct of officials in charge of grain warehouses, the sacrifice for dead parents, and the division of inheritance, but the fragmentary condition of the text does not allow one to obtain a clear idea of the contexts.

Then Telepinus enacted a law concerning the murder of persons not of the royal family. The operation of the law depended on the heir of the murdered person; if he should request the death penalty, the murderer must be killed; if not, the penalty could be mitigated and an indemnity be paid by the murderer. In no case, however, should the parties in the action be permitted to come before the king—probably a distinction between local and royal jurisdiction.

The last law concerns sorcery which, it is stated, had to be purified ritualistically in Hattusas. A person knowing about such an affair in the royal family was commanded to fetch the member of the family to the gate of the palace for trial, for, if he were not brought, the sorcerer would be in a position to harm any man who knew about the witchcraft.¹³²

The Old Kingdom closes with Telepinus. Although the date generally accepted is 1650 B.C.,¹³³ we really do not know how or when his reign ended. It is probable that after him a certain Alluwamnas, mentioned in a list of kings,¹³⁴ and whose seal is extant, succeeded to the throne. No other Hittite king¹³⁵ is known until the time of Tuthaliyas, the third predecessor of Suppiluliumas. Only with that ruler can Hittite history again be resumed, but by that time the Empire has begun.

Samuhas (cf. Mayer and Garstang, *Index of Hittite Names*, pp. 40 f.). In the same text ships go from Arziyas, which must also have lain on the Euphrates. *KBo IV 13 i 36 f.* interjects it between Samuhas and Pitiyarigas.

¹³² Or do the words mean that a man who did not report such an affair was as guilty as the person practicing sorcery and therefore might suffer punishment along with his household? Olmstead (*Assyria*, p. 554) has pointed out that sorcery was feared in Assyria because it was often directed against the state (cf. G. R. Driver and John C. Miles, *The Assyrian Laws*, pp. 118 f., for a general discussion of witchcraft in Assyria, but one which does not treat Olmstead's point). The pronouncement against sorcery in Hattusas may have been inspired by a similar fear, especially since maltreatment of the purification objects was an enchantment whose regulation was under the authority of the king (cf. A. Walther, in J. M. P. Smith, *Origin and History of Hebrew Law*, p. 254, § 44B).

¹³³ Götze, *AO*, XXVII, 19. This date is computed by counting from the reign of Mursilis I, whose time can be only approximated by the end of the First Dynasty of Babylon; therefore 1650 is not exact and may have to be changed.

¹³⁴ 2 *BoTU* 25 i 19; 26:6; 27:5; cf. also *KUB XXVI 77:10*.

¹³⁵ See Appen. C.

APPENDIX A

See text, p. 193. Our chief source is the treaty between Mursilis II and Talmi-šarruma (probable reading for Rimi-šarma) of Aleppo in *KBo* I 6 i 11-14; duplicate *KUB* III 6. Cf. D. D. Luckenbill, "Hittite Treaties and Letters," *AJSL*, XXXVII (1921), 188 f.; E. F. Weidner, "Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien," *BoSt*, VIII (1923), 80 f.; Albrecht Götze, "Die historische Einleitung des Aleppos Vertrage," *MAOG*, IV (1928), 59-66; cf. also A. T. Olmstead, *Palestine and Syria*, p. 117. Besides this source we have the texts 2 *BoTU* 20:10 f. and 10β:30 f.

No problem arises from the statement that Hattusilis attacked the city, but much difference of opinion exists as to what happened there. The usual translation involves the idea that Hattusilis destroyed the city as did Mursilis I later. A study of the treaty, however, shows that the action of Hattusilis is contrasted with, or differentiated from, that of Mursilis; furthermore, two words occurring in this section of the document are illuminating. *Šabātu* by derivation can mean "to possess or to hold (land)"; in the third stem, *malá*, from which *ultamli* (l. 12) seems to be derived, does not carry the idea of "to cause to be full" in the sense of destruction or bringing to an end, as is usually asserted. An examination of various passages in which the III² stem is used has demonstrated it means "to make complete, to bring to a height, to make (one's complement) complete," and also "to provide (a person with land as a holding)" (cf. the uses of this stem in F. Thureau-Dangin, "La Correspondance de Hammurapi avec Šamaš-Ḫâšir," *RA*, XXI [1924], 23, No. 25:6, 9, and p. 42, No. 55:16; *VS*, Vol. XVI, No. 126:20; L. W. King, *Hammurabi Letters*, No. 1:25). Thus when the two words are taken together, we obtain the concept that the kings of Aleppo held a kingdom from Hattusilis I. 2 *BoTU* 20 ii 13 gives the same impression; *aniyawanzi pais* (contrary to *HAB*, pp. 55, n. 9, and 213, n. 6) means here "to perform" not "to fulfil," "to bring to an end." Forrer's restoration of LUGAL-UT-TA (l. 13) fits better than the suggestion of Sommer. In the duplicate (*KUB* XXVI 72:9) is preserved LUGAL KUR URUHalpa. While LUGAL is not preserved in 2 *BoTU* 20 it probably should belong after [Mursilis] in line 14, for its occurrence in *KUB* XXVI 72 coincides with the statement in the treaty that Mursilis destroyed both the kingdom and the land of Aleppo. Putting together 2 *BoTU* 20:12-14 and *KUB* XXVI 72:9, we translate as follows: "Which [kingship Hattusilis] gave Halap to perform, [Mursilis] destroyed, [(and)] the king of the land of Halap." While it is not an altogether satisfactory translation, it seems the best so far attempted.

2 *BoTU* 10β:30 f. can be interpreted that Aleppo was made subject to the Hittites but was not destroyed. It revolted and broke its oath; therefore, it would be destroyed. This revolt would give the reason for Mursilis' attack. We cannot accept the idea which has been advanced in *HAB*, p. 214, that Hattusilis met injury or death at Aleppo. There is nothing either in the decree

which named his successor or in any other document which implies that situation; rather, Hattusilis seems to have fallen ill in Kussaras, and his death was expected there at the time he drew up his decree.

Mention should be made here of another text in which Aleppo is named, 2 *BoTU* 14β + Bo 7986 (= *KUB* XXXI 4). The opening paragraphs are mythological or ritualistic, but the last paragraph (ll. 20–24) apparently contains historical information. Tentatively the following translation is offered:

20. [someone or something] is ^dUTU-us, and he continually writes *pisenus* (acc. pl.): go to the city Halpas

21. to [. . .]-*tis* speak! Behold ^m. . .-ja-aḫ-šu-uš and Zidis then [did something](?)

22. . . .-*sus*, now the city Hattusas [. . .]-*naras*, and Zidis, and the city Hattu[sas]

23. . . .-*en*! Speak! Bring! To Halpas come! Their country attack!

24. In [. . .]-*sa* they shall afterward be destroyed(?); to Halpas come!

This section mentions Zidis, who is known from 12A ii 1, and 12C:11, and ^m. . .-ja-aḫ-šu-uš, who reminds one of Ispudahsus of 12B i 6, 12, and 13. I owe the privilege of copying this document before it was published to the late Professor Ehelolf.

In view of the repeated phrase “to Halpas come,” we may have another chant similar to 2 *BoTU* 14α:13–15; cf. Hrozný, *ArO*, I, 297; *HAB*, p. 158, n. 3; and H. Pederson, *Hittitisch und die Indoeuropen Sprache*, p. 199.

APPENDIX B

See text, p. 210. The significance of the Hittite assemblies—for we believe two existed and must be considered—is not clear. One important consideration, however, as pointed out by Götze (*Kleinasien*, pp. 81 f.), is that their relationship to the king, and their regulation of his acts, is not oriental. The earliest datable reference to assemblies comes from Hattusilis I when he designated his successor—an act reserved for the king no matter what checks were on his behavior—and proclaimed his choice before his assemblies whose names are preserved completely only in the Akkadian version. One is called ERIN^{MEŠ} *nagbâti*, and the other *kabtâti*; the former is equal to the Hittite *pankus* (cf. 2 *BoTU* 8 ii||ii 1), but the evidence for the equation of *tuliyas* with *kabtâti* is dubious (cf. Götze, *Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*, p. 36, n. 77, who equates it with Akkadian *puḫru*). The phrase ERIN^{MEŠ} *nagbâti* indicates that in this group we have the assembly of the warriors in arms, while *kabtâti* may mean the chief dignitaries or elders of the realm, hence the counselors of the king. The former is probably the same as ERIN^{MEŠ} *pankus* (*KBo* IV 4 iv 8); thus together with such expressions as *nu* LÚKUR^{URU} *Kaskas pankun ERIN^{MEŠ} Šuti* [. . .] (2 *BoTU* 34 i 6; *KUB* XIX 11 i 6) and *pankûn Šuti* (2 *BoTU* 37 i 5) we might be able to gain a possible explanation if we consider the *pankus* as the totality of men capable of bearing arms.

Hattusilis I, in order to prevent bloodshed and disunity, bound the two assemblies to his appointee to the throne, who was placed under obligation to carry out his part of the compact by consulting with the *pankus* (2 *BoTU* 8 iii 61 f.). Telepinus employed the terms *pankus* and *tuliyas* quite specifically and had in mind definite functions of each, which, because of our lack of knowledge, seem to overlap. Among the powers of the *tuliyas* specified by Telepinus was the right to sit as a trial court in cases of regicide and in cases arising from harm a king might do his brothers or sisters. From other literature, especially treaties of the Empire, the conclave of the gods referred to in the oath formula is called the *tuliyas*, and, as such, was invoked to witness the affirmations of the contracting parties (=Akkadian *puḫur ilāni*).

The workings of the *pankus* are as hard to ascertain as those of the *tuliyas*, although it also appears to have had both advisory and judicial functions. In Hattusilis I's decree (2 *BoTU* 8 iii 61-62) the king tells his successor to go before the *pankus* for advice if anyone spoke a salacious word or injured the gods. The dependence of the king on the *pankus* in this connection may be overaccentuated because of the minority of the successor. Telepinus also tells the *pankus* to warn a king who planned injury to his brothers or sisters (*ibid.* 23A ii 46 f.; contrast with ii 50 f.). As a judicial body, in distinction to the *tuliyas* which controlled misdeeds of the royal family, it tried and punished lay figures (*ibid.* 23A ii 72)—as when Tanuwas, Taharwailis, and Taruhsus were presumably tried and sentenced. The *pankus*, as may be inferred from Telepinus' decree, was composed of many officials, including princes, *Mešidimen*, golden squires, cupbearers, *salashiyas*-men, and captains of a thousand.

Thus we may summarize. Two assemblies existed in the Hittite governmental organization: the *tuliyas* (which may be the same as the *kabtāti*) and the *pankus* (which is equal to the *nagbāti*). Both had judicial powers, the former over the king, the latter over other individuals. The *pankus* further had advisory functions which so far have not been found in the *tuliyas*. The two groups are distinct in Telepinus, but less so in the decree of Hattusilis I—the most detailed sources that we have from the Old Kingdom for an examination of the assemblies. Hence these bodies may have gone through some evolution before the time of Telepinus, who may have given them new functions and powers, although our scanty material does not permit a clear analysis on this point. When confronted with discrepancies or contradictions in the language of Telepinus or Hattusilis, we must recognize that they were reciting a decree orally—later to be written down—before two groups; hence presumably they would be turning from one to the other during the delivery.

If we may proceed from the statement of Götze given in the opening sentence of this appendix, we may suggest that the Hittite organization of assemblies resembled that of other Indo-European-speaking peoples and might be compared to the Council of Elders and the Popular Assembly of the Homeric Greeks, or the *senatus* and *comitia tributa* of the Romans. (For a different interpretation cf. *HAB*, pp. 138, 185, and "Index.")

APPENDIX C

See text, p. 212. We have a list of kings (2 *BoTU* 24–29) whom Forrer, *ibid.*, 13*–29*, believes followed Telepinus in a so-called Dark Age. The striking fact about these listed kings is that they correspond—with the exception of Alluwamnas—to known rulers of either the Old Kingdom or the Empire. This makes it quite possible that, contrary to Forrer, only Alluwamnas can be placed after Telepinus. E. Cavaignac accepted Forrer's arrangement in general ("La Chronologie des rois hittites antérieur à Dudḫaliya III [env. 1420]," *RHA*, I [1930–32], 72–75) but has recently pointed out that the kings who immediately follow Alluwamnas in the lists are those who preceded Telepinus and come in the order given in his decree, although he still accepts Forrer's supposition that Alluwamnas followed Telepinus ("La Maison de Suppiluliuma," *RHA*, III [1934–36], 237–39 and n. 11).

The new chronology, which is still under discussion (cf. Albright, *BASOR*, No. 77, pp. 20 f., and Sidney Smith, *Alalah and Chronology*), removes difficulties from Hittite history, for, by this means of dating, the gap between the Old Kingdom and the Empire is nearly closed. Alluwamnas, and possibly one or two others who may have existed, can be placed in the few years still remaining between Telepinus and the first king of the Empire; then Forrer's hypothetical structure needs no longer be considered.

In addition to the seal of Alluwamnas (*MDOG*, LXXIV [March, 1936], 70), an earlier campaign at Boğazköy yielded one bearing an inscription "the seal of *tabarna huzziya*, the great king" which may or may not be considered the name of a ruler (Eduard Meyer, *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter* [1914], p. 44, Fig. 34; K. Bittel and H. G. Güterbock, *Boğazköy: Neue Untersuchungen in der hethitischen Hauptstadt* [*APAW* (Jahrgang 1935, Phil.-hist. Klasse, No. 1)], p. 74 and Pl. 26, No. 7). That it bears the name of a king, we can see no reason to doubt. If so, it can belong more probably to the Huzziyas who succeeded Ammunas than to a Huzziyas II whom Forrer postulated as having reigned during the Dark Age. If it belongs to the first Huzziyas, it means the dynasty of the Old Kingdom used the hieroglyphic form of writing from an early time (the inscription is in both cuneiform and hieroglyphics). Alluwamnas' seal likewise bears the same type of writing.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

